LETTER TO THE REV. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.

ON

HIS UNFAIR TREATMENT OF THE TESTIMONY OF THE FATHERS, CONCERNING THE DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE.

WITH A REFUTATION OF THAT DOCTRINE,

BY

JOHN HARRISON, D.D.

VICAR OF FENWICK, NEAR DONCASTER.

Author of "Whose are the Fathers?" "The Primitive Mode of Making Bishops." "An Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge respecting the Doctrine of the Real Presence." "The Fathers *versus* Dr Pusey." "The Eastward Portion unscriptural and not Primitive and Catholic." "The True Bread of Life and how to receive it," and other Works.

THE RELIGIOUS BOOK SOCIETY.

LONDON: 28, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.;

AND BAZAAR, SOHO SQUARE.

1877.

Price Two Shillings, printed on thick paper, and neatly bound in cloth.

N.B.—The following letter is only in a very small degree supplemental to the author' ' Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge,' and is by no means intended to supersede it. Instead, there fore, of encumbering the letter with long references to original works, it has been though sufficient simply to refer to the above-named work where proper, and full citations will be found The second volume of that work consists wholly of extracts from the writings of authors, includin sixteen of the chief of Dr Pusey's own chosen Fathers, other important early Christian authors four early Reformers, and authors who have defended and maintained the doctrine of the rea presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements, including Paschasius Radbert, th first formal promulgator of the doctrine ; all of which extracts are accompanied with reference to the writings of the respective authors whence they have been made. This volum forms 35 pages, which may be regarded as the text ; and the first volume, consisting of 674 pages, contain the discussion founded thereon. From the quotations in the second volume references are mad to those parts of the first where they are noticed. In the following letter, instead of referring t the original writings of the Fathers, of Dr Wiseman, and of Dr Pusey, they are referred to a quoted in the above-named volume. Such figures as the following, 21, 10, 35, 40, refer to the second volume ; the former is a reference to an extract from the writings of Augustine, and th latter is a reference to an extract from the writings of Dr Pusey. The following kind of figure refer to the chapters and sections of the first volume, viii. 21, ix. 110.

Rev. Sir,

1. The propriety of addressing a letter to you on the manner in which you have treated what you call 'Testimony to 'the belief in the Real Presence in the Early 'Church,' needs no apology, for the requirements of truth and the defence of our common faith more than justify such a step. I have had it in mind to address you personally on this subject during the last three years. About six years ago, I published a work entitled 'An answer to Dr Pusey's challenge 'respecting the doctrine of the Real Presence, in which the doctrines of the Lord's 'Supper as held by him, by Roman and 'Greek Catholics, Ritualists, and High Anglo-'Catholics, are examined and shown to be 'contrary to the Holy Scriptures, and to the 'Teaching of the Fathers of the first eight 'centuries with the testimony of an ample '*catena patrum* of the same period.'

2. This work was extensively reviewed in thirty-three periodicals, which came under my own notice. Some of these dwelt upon what they called 'Dr Pusey's inaccuracy of 'quotation from the Fathers.' This was especially noticed by the reviewer in the *Christian Advocate*, who considered that I had not made your inaccuracy of quotation from the Fathers so conspicuous as it might have been made. He said, 'Could the proofs 'of Dr Pusey's inaccuracy be marshalled in 'a pointed and effective manner so as to 'bring them within the examination of 'ordinary readers, a blow would be struck at 'sacerdotal theology, of which it would be 'difficult to overrate the effects.' To meet this requirement, I published a post 8vo volume of 200 pages, entitled 'The Fathers '*versus* Dr Pusey: An Exposure of his unfair 'treatment of their Evidence on the Doctrine 'of the Real Presence.' This little book was reviewed in twenty-four different periodicals. Again, some of the reviewers very pointedly dwelt upon what they considered your unfair manner of quoting the writings of the Fathers. The reviewer in the *Christian Observer* stated, 'The volume is devoted to the substantiation 'of these very serious allegations, and start-'ling instances are adduced, which most 'unquestionably demand full and satisfactory 'explanation. Dr Pusey is now a very aged 'man, but his fair fame must be an object of 'concern to many who share his opinions. 'There must be some one among them, al-'though there may probably not be many, 'who has sufficient acquaintance with pat-'ristic learning to rebut this crushing ex-'posure, if indeed the assertions of Dr 'Harrison can be met. As it is, Dr Pusey 'is arraigned before the world on charges 'which amount to mendacity of the most 'shameful and disingenuous character. The 'system of Rome, it is true, is a system of 'forgery and lies; but he never has professed 'that he is a Romanist. We shall wait with 'much anxiety to see what answer can be 'made by him, or for him.' January 1874.

3. It is quite possible that neither my books, nor those reviews in which were noticed your inaccuracy of quotation, ever came under your observation. Probably you would be more likely to see such periodicals as the *John Bull*, *The Church Review*, *The Literary Churchman*, *The Church Times*, *The Guardian*, and *The Tablet*. But in not one of these periodicals is there any allusion to your unfairness of quotations, except in the last, in which it is said, 'Dr Harrison, who 'is a follower of Zuinglius and Hooker, sets 'himself to prove that Dr Pusey, in his 'Doctrine of the Real Presence, was guilty 'of misquoting the Fathers.'—26th April 1873.

4. Some of the other reviewers, instead of criticising the main points of the book, content themselves with abusing the author. The *John Bull* and *The Guardian* give much the same reason for barely noticing my book. The former says:—

5. 'In our own blissful state of ignorance 'we have turned to the table of contents 'judiciously prefixed to the present publica-'tion, and we find that it is directed not 'merely against the metaphysical phrases of 'objective and subjective, but against the 'whole doctrine of the Real Presence, and 'the value of apostolical consecration itself. 'The author undertakes to refute not only 'Dr Pusey, Mr Mackonochie, and the late 'Bishop Hamilton, but "the novel criticisms 'of Bishop Wordsworth of Lincoln, and the 'misconceptions of Bishop Harold Browne!" 'He "proves" that Zwingle's Eucharistic 'teaching is the same with that of Calvin, 'Cranmer, and Jewel . . . we are here con-'tent to stop, grateful for the forewarning 'which enables us to escape the rest of his '1060 pages of Edinburgh Divinity.'—20th January 1872.

6. It is now more than three years since the volume was published which more especially points out your unfair treatment of the evidence of the Fathers on the doctrine of the Real Presence. But as yet you have given no answer, nor has any one for you. My conviction that it is your Christian duty to offer some public explanation respecting what at present appears the inexplicable manner in which you have treated the testimony of the Fathers is confirmed by the fact, that many of the thirty-six favourable reviews of my two works above-named gave prominence to your unfair treatment of the testimony of the Fathers, while on the other hand, those reviews which were on your side made no allusion whatever to your conduct in that respect.

7. That you may see how your treatment of the testimony of the Fathers has been regarded by some of the most able and learned men both of England and Scotland, I will now give a few extracts from their reviews.

8. *The Christian Advocate and Review*, April 1872.—'But there still remains another ' and a graver question, and one which for ' the sake of the truth involved in this con- ' troversy, it is impossible to blink: Are ' the quotations made by Dr Pusey trust- ' worthy, and do they fairly represent the ' true opinion of Christian antiquity on the ' subject of the Sacraments? It is very diffi- ' cult to conceive that this question can ' truly be answered in the negative. Misre- ' presentation of authorities is the gravest ' offence of which a controversialist can be ' guilty. Dr Pusey's high position in the ' University of Oxford, and the confidence ' placed in his personal character, alike ren- ' der the supposition one which the mind ' shrinks from entertaining, save on the most ' positive and conclusive evidence. Never- ' theless, this evidence is at hand, and it ' compels us to answer the question in the ' negative. The quotations of Dr Pusey are ' not trustworthy. Not only do they not ' authorize the conclusions drawn from them, ' but they do not fully represent the real sentiment of the very passages whence they have been selected. We repeat, and we do with sincerity, our full conviction that there is no conscious dishonesty in Dr Pusey's mind. He puts forward what appears to him to be the truth; but whether it is from the force of one habitual mode of ' regarding the Fathers,—whether it is from ' having quoted, in some cases at all events, ' second-hand, without personally submitting ' the quotations to verification,—whether it ' is that the work of extracting the passages ' for his Catena has been entrusted to ' others,—or whether it is that the mind has ' became so wholly tinctured with a precon- ' ceived conception as to colour everything ' with its own hues, we are unable to say. ' But the fact appears to us to be indisput- ' able, and Dr Harrison's bulky volumes teem ' with evidences of it. We said that no task ' could be more important than that of test- ' ing the real theological value of Dr Pusey's ' Catena. Its importance does not relate to ' Dr Pusey himself, but to the interest of the ' truth. The number of Ritualists who have ' themselves studied the Fathers is probably ' very small. The bulk, at all events, will ' have rested on Dr Pusey's quotations, and ' will probably repudiate with indignation ' the very suggestion that they are not to be ' depended upon. We think that this con- ' fidence is quite natural, and fully justified ' by the circumstances of the case. If the ' authority of the great Anglican Doctor, as ' he has been called, cannot be trusted, in ' whom shall confidence be placed? If this ' authority be overthrown, the main pillar of ' sacerdotal theology is overthrown, and its ' cause is lost. Hence the task to which Dr ' Harrison has addressed himself is critical ' and important to the extreme.' Five pages of striking illustrations of your unfair treat- ment of patristic evidence then follow.

9. In another periodical it is stated, 'As ' Dr Harrison abundantly proves the doctrine ' of the Real Presence, as Romanists and ' Ritualists hold it, was never heard of till ' Paschasius invented it in the ninth century. ' Yet Dr Pusey not only maintains that it ' was held by all the early Fathers of the ' Christian Church, but, in a book which he ' has published, he gives 400 pages of quota- ' tions from the writings of these Fathers, to ' show by their own words that they did hold ' and teach it. Now one feels very curious ' to know by what process he satisfies him- ' self and his followers that the writings of ' men teach a doctrine, abhorrent alike to ' Scripture and to common sense, through ' nine long centuries before it was invented! ' The reader of these volumes will find that ' this marvellous feat—almost as marvellous ' as the doctrine itself—is accomplished by a ' variety of expedients; some of them, how- ' ever, we are sorry to say, anything but ' creditable to Dr Pusey.'

10. 'In the first place, it is here clearly ' and unmistakably shown that the Doctor— ' thinking, perhaps as he was borrowing from ' Rome at any rate, he might borrow a little ' of the practice of Jesuitical reservation— ' has garbled many of his extracts from the ' Fathers. He has been conveniently blind ' to statements in the context, or in other ' parts of the writings of the same Father, ' which show that the meaning he puts in ' the words extracted, is the opposite of the ' true one.'

11. Another periodical states, 'The smaller ' work which we owe to the same author, ' *The Fathers* versus *Dr Pusey*, relates more ' directly to the inaccuracy and unfairness of ' Dr Pusey in his quotations. The larger ' one, of which we have already spoken, em- ' braces the whole question. It was of im- ' portance for general readers, that the matter ' should be brought in a narrower compass ' than such an extensive investigation would ' permit. Fixing, therefore, directly on the ' points on which the Fathers had been ' signally misrepresented by his opponent, ' Dr Harrison gives the substance of his ' learned disquisitions on the question within ' limits which any reader can easily overtake. ' We honestly prefer the larger work. It is ' a store-house of facts and arguments on the ' subject; and in proportion as the mind is ' intent on a thorough prosecution of all the ' details of the controversy, it will find the ' copious exposition of Dr Harrison only the ' more interesting from its very minuteness. ' The second volume of "*The Answer*" is ' occupied with the quotations from the ' Fathers, and contains, reproduced from Dr ' Pusey at length, the arguments which he ' employs. Dr Pusey cannot complain that ' his views are misrepresented, for they are

'given precisely in his own words. Dr 'Pusey, on the other hand, is not allowed 'to misrepresent the Fathers, for they are 'made to speak for themselves. Clauses 'omitted by him are supplied; passages 'elsewhere in the same author, to which Dr 'Pusey makes no reference, are given in full. 'The quotations on which he lays the chief 'stress—his sixteen principal witnesses—are 'discussed with patient industry and 'thorough fairness. The effect of the whole 'is to bring out the truth with singular 'vividness. . . . With such a work as this 'of Dr Harrison's before the public, unrefuted 'and untouched, it must henceforth be a 'proof, not of erudition, but of ignorance, 'to affirm that any vestiges of the heresy 'can be discovered before the days of 'Radbert.'

12. 'Not the least valuable of the incidental 'results emerging from the laborious re-'searches of Dr Harrison is the vindication 'of Zwingle from the charge of Zwinglianism. 'The name of that honoured reformer has 'been most unwarrantably used to designate 'an error which he never adopted or advo-'cated,—the error, namely, that the Sacra-'ment is exclusively a symbol, and that the 'spiritual presence of Christ, or the special 'manifestation of grace in connection with 'it, is not to be expected. In the strong 'clear language in which he denies that the 'bread is the real body as well as the sign 'of the body, he was not called to indicate 'other views of the ordinance. Such writers 'as Bishop Browne and Canon Liddon, by 'an extraordinary blunder represent Zwingle 'as rejecting sacramental grace in every 'sense, and denying the presence of Christ 'in the ordinance. They represent the Re-'former as differing in this respect from 'Calvin and Cranmer. Nothing is more 'conclusively established by Dr Harrison 'than that this is an entire mistake. We 'might as well speak of Hookerism as 'Zwinglianism, for the statements of Hooker 'on this point remarkably correspond with 'those of the Reformer of Zurich.'

13. Another review states 'Dr Pusey's 'unfairness as a controversialist. It is 'probable that the number of Ritualists who 'have for themselves examined and ascer-'tained what the Fathers teach is very 'small. Even their leading men seem to 'rely exclusively upon the statements made 'by Dr Pusey in his "Doctrine of the Real 'Presence." Archdeacon Denison, for ex-'ample, in his published "Defence," under 'the heading "Witnesses of Antiquity," has 'simply adduced those witnesses which had 'been selected for him by Dr Pusey. And 'Mr Keble, asserting that the whole Christian 'world had been with one voice declaring 'its faith in the real presence of Christ in 'the Sacrament, adds, "This I do not pro-'fess to demonstrate, but accept it as de-'monstrated by Dr Pusey." Dr Pusey him-'self claims to have impartially dealt with 'the subject which he handled. "I have 'now, he says, "gone through every writer 'who speaks of the Holy Eucharist. . . . I 'have suppressed nothing; I have not 'knowingly omitted anything. I have given 'every passage, as far as in me lay, with so 'much of the context as was necessary for 'the clear exhibition of its meaning."'

14. 'In these circumstances a careful ex-'amination of Dr Pusey's quotations from 'the Fathers became very desirable, not 'because we admit an ultimate appeal to 'them, but because we believe ourselves 'entitled to reply to all Ritualists. "Such 'doctrines are not to be found in Scripture, 'nor have they ever been believed among us 'from the beginning." The result of such a 'careful examination [The Fathers *versus* Dr 'Pusey; an Exposure of his Unfair Treat-'ment of their Evidence in the Doctrine of 'the Real Presence, by John Harrison, D.D.] 'is that it appears:—

15. (1) 'That Dr Pusey has attributed to 'the Fathers doctrines on the strength of 'some particular expressions, which, a fuller 'inquiry into their style of reasoning, would 'show that they did not hold.

16. (2) 'That he has been guilty of sup-'pressing portions of his quotations, so as 'to conceal the true sense of the author.

17. (3) 'That he has, in several cases, mis-'translated the authors from whom he 'quotes.

18. (4) 'That he quotes, as from the 'Fathers, passages which do not appear in 'their works.

19. (5) 'That he has omitted to include in 'his *catena* many passages which have a very 'distinct bearing upon the doctrine in ques-'tion.' The Reviewer then adduces evidence in proof of these charges, and concludes thus:—

20. 'A Reviewer of Dr Harrison's book 'admits that Dr Pusey's quotations are un-'trustworthy and his conclusions false, yet 'he does not impute dishonesty to him. It 'may be that such an imputation is not de-'served; and yet, if by quoting at second 'hand without verification or by entrusting 'the work of forming his *catena* to others, or 'if because "his mind has become so tinc-'tured with a preconceived conception as to 'colour everything with his own views" [see 'section 8 above], he has given forth to the 'world an entirely erroneous view of the 'teaching of the Fathers,—why then, at least, 'his *book* is dishonest. And if neither Dr 'Pusey nor his friends choose to notice the 'proofs adduced of the unfairness and in-'accuracy of his book, we fear that it will be 'impossible to shield them from the more 'serious imputation.'

21. In another learned organ it is stated: —'To give our readers some more definite

'idea of the work, we may mention that in 'one of his books Dr Pusey publishes no 'fewer than 400 pages of extracts from the 'Fathers as evidence, to quote his own words, '"that the belief in the Real Presence was 'part of the faith of Christians from the first." 'Dr Harrison has subjected this mass of evi- 'dence to the thorough sifting which a full 'and accurate knowledge of the writings of 'the Fathers enabled him to give it, and he 'here gives enough of the results to satisfy 'every reader that, when subjected to the 'test of fair and honest criticism, not a trace 'of the doctrine of the Real Presence, as held 'by Dr Pusey, is to be found in it all. He 'makes it quite apparent that the Fathers 'teach no such doctrine, and that Dr Pusey 'manages to make them appear to teach it 'by mistranslation in some cases; by bare- 'faced garbling and suppression of the con- 'text in others; by leaving out of view what 'is essential to an understanding of the pa- 'tristic language and principles of interpre- 'tation; and, particularly, by blinking the 'fact that, in speaking of the Lord's Supper, 'the Fathers constantly employ the sacra- 'mental language of Scripture, in which the 'sign is named by the thing which it signi- 'fies.' Then a series of proofs of the allega- tions follows.

22. *The Christian Advocate and Review*, April 1874:—'When we reviewed Dr Harri- 'son's two large volumes against Dr Pusey, 'we expressed our deep regret that their size, 'and extent, and somewhat loose arrange- 'ment would probably deprive them of the 'circulation they deserve, and disable them 'from exercising the influence to which they 'are entitled. Dr Harrison has taken the ad- 'vice of his friends, and has reproduced the gist 'of his argument in one thin octavo volume. 'We earnestly hope that, in this shape, the 'result of his learned labours will be more 'widely known and better appreciated; for 'the exposure of Dr Pusey's unfair treatment 'of his authorities is complete; and it cannot 'be too widely known, and, therefore, not 'too frequently repeated, that Dr Pusey's 'quotations are not to be trusted, but need 'to be examined with the most scrupulous 'care. We regret to say that this charge of 'unfairness and inaccuracy lies not against 'Dr Pusey alone, but in general against the 'whole school, of which he is the acknow- 'ledged head.'

23. Such is but a specimen of the impression produced upon the minds of those learned men who have been at the trouble to examine the manner in which you have treated the testimony of the Fathers in regard to the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements. My conviction then, that herein you are greatly in fault, is not only confirmed by the expressed opinions of distinguished men, but I am the more encouraged to communicate to you some of the more fatal defects in your alleged testimon of the Fathers.

24. I have no doubt, judging from the styl in which some of your school have spoken o me in their reviews of my writings, I shal be represented as very presumptuous fo venturing to address you on this importan subject. I am not authorised by any Diocesa Synod or Provincial Council. I possess n ecclesiastical authority to invest me with th right of addressing you upon the present subject or any other. Am I asked then by your ardent disciples why I presume to take this seemingly bold step? I answer this question by asking another. Who gave you, their teacher and guide, authority to write and to have printed more than 1200 pages of letters addressed to an archbishop, bishops, a learned doctor, and a 'dearest friend'? Of this last letter more than 5000 were published, and among other extraordinary things was recorded the astounding opinion that our Article on Transubstantiation does not contradict the Catechism of the Council of Trent —that Transubstantiation is probably but a question of words between us and Roman Catholics. As you then have taken upon you to address letters to individuals, some of them in high position, and not so much to instruct them as the public, so in writing a letter to you for the benefit of others I do herein but follow your example. You, a presbyter, assume the right to exercise all the means in your power to reintroduce the practices and doctrines of Rome into the English Church; I, as a presbyter, assume the right to exercise all the means in my power to prevent you and your disciples from reintroducing any more Romish errors, and to root out what you and your friends have already introduced. I am free to admit that the disparity between our positions as presbyters is great, and although fictitious in regard to the point in hand, is by many regarded as if it were real. What Jerome, however, said in his day is just as true in our day. 'Wher- 'ever there is a bishop [or presbyter], be it at 'Rome or Eugubium, at Constantinople or 'Rhegium, Alexandria or Tanis, [Oxford or 'Fenwick], they are of the same merit, of 'the same priesthood. The power of riches 'and the meanness of poverty makes not a 'bishop [or presbyter] higher or lower, for 'they are all successors of the Apostles.'

25. Before proceeding to point out the more striking instances of your unfair treatment of the testimony of the Fathers, it will be necessary to form a correct estimate of the purpose for which you have alleged it, and duly to consider your own statements respecting its completeness and the very accurate and fair manner in which you say you have prepared it, and also to state the extent to which my examination of it has extended.

26. Of the witnesses which you have adduced as 'testimony to the belief in the real

'presence in the early Church,' I have more especially examined sixteen of the more important of them, namely, Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, Eusebius of Cæsarea, Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil, Ambrose, Jerome, Gaudentius, Augustine, Chrysostom, and Theodoret. The quotations which you have made from these Fathers form about half of your 400 pages of patristic testimony.

27. As the substance of what I shall have to bring forward in this letter, both as respects your unfair treatment of the testimony of the Fathers and your statements of doctrine, have already appeared in my work entitled 'An Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge,' references will for the most part be made to that work, in which full references will be found both to the original writings of the Fathers and to your own. I send a copy of this work for your acceptance, and beg you to observe where in this letter such figures of reference occur as the following, xii. 10, xiii. 27, the references are to the chapters and sections of the first volume of the above-named work. Such figures of reference as these, **25**, 10; **36**, 40, refer to the second volume of that work. This volume, you will notice, consists wholly of extracts from the writings of authors, viz., the Fathers, ancient Christian writers, early Reformers, and the teachers and defenders of the doctrine of the real presence, including Paschasius, its first promulgator, Dr Wiseman, yourself, and others. In this volume extracts are given from sixteen of your witnesses, which in many instances are so given as not only to include your quotations but with so much of the context as in many instances to show that the witness to whom you appeal is against, and not for, you. Other extracts exhibit notable omissions on your part, which, had you quoted them, your readers would have seen that your authorities do not hold your doctrine, but teach that which is subversive of it. By reading the first 219 pages of the second volume, which consist only of extracts from the Fathers, you will anticipate much more of the real character of your treatment of their testimony than I can exhibit in this letter. If your friends should demand why I have not examined the whole of your extracts from the Fathers, I answer it is unnecessary in order either to ascertain the real character of your quotations or even to know the real teaching of the early Church concerning the Lord's Supper. The entire testimony of the Fathers concerning the Lord's Supper is an immense field, which few, even if they had time and ability, would have the patience personally to investigate. I maintain, however, that the true testimony of the early Church can be substantially obtained by the examination of the combined testimony of three such leading Fathers, and well reputed biblical scholars, as Origen of the third century, Jerome of the fourth, and Theodoret of the fifth century. All that you have considered suitable to quote from those three authors in support of your doctrine I have included in my extracts from them in my second volume. A candid examination of the testimony of those three authors as there given can lead to no other conclusion than that they teach that which is subversive of your doctrine.

28. To come more especially to the point in hand, I shall give your own account of what you consider to be the completeness of the testimony of the Fathers, for the purpose for which you have adduced it, and the honourable manner in which you say you have collated it. Before citing your 400 pages of testimony you write, 'The following 'evidence that the belief in the Real Presence 'was part of the faith of Christians from the 'first is more than enough to convince one 'who is willing to be convinced. If this 'convince not, neither would any other. 'There is no flaw, no doubt, I might almost 'say, no loop-hole, except that man always 'finds one to escape what he is unwilling to 'accept' (**35**, 39.)

29. After having quoted your 400 pages, you further write, 'I have now, as I could 'in the space of time which seemed open 'to me, before this fundamental doctrine 'might be disputed before a legal tribunal, 'gone through every writer who, in his extant works speaks of the Holy Eucharist, 'from the time when St John the Evangelist 'was translated to his Lord, to the date of 'the Fourth General Council, A.D. 451, a 'period of three centuries and a half. I have 'suppressed nothing; I have not knowingly 'omitted any thing; I have given every 'passage, as far as in me lay, with so much 'of the context as was necessary for the clear 'exhibition of its meaning' (**35**, 41).

30. By these statements you give your readers to understand that you have fully and fairly given the complete testimony of the Fathers, including the extracts commonly quoted by Roman Catholics, and the chief passages which have been quoted against the Roman doctrine of the Real Presence for a thousand years. Suppose, for instance, you had quoted fairly and honestly such passages only as seemed best calculated to defend Archdeacon Denison, and suppressed all such passages from the Fathers, which in effect condemn his doctrine, you would have done what is but too common in most controversies, that is, stated the best evidence you could on your side the question. But your strong impressive statements imply much more than this, for to affirm 'There is no flaw, no 'doubt, &c.,' would be ridiculous, if you had carefully excluded all such passages as were calculated to make flaws in your evidence, or occasion doubts respecting its value. But you affirm, 'I have suppressed

'nothing; I have not knowingly omitted 'any thing.'

31. Such is the character which you give of your own performance, which doubtless is very fully believed by those who have accepted you as their guide in such matters. I shall now point out to you that your performance is essentially different from the account which you give of it.

32. According to your own statement you have collated your patristic testimony as 'evidence that the belief in the Real Presence 'was part of the faith of the early Church 'from the first.' This statement is both inaccurate and indefinite. It is inaccurate especially as regards Augustine and his disciples, for they repudiated a belief *in* any thing except the Persons of the Holy Trinity and herein they followed the example of Holy Scripture. The phrase 'belief in or of 'the Real Presence,' is indefinite as to its extent of meaning. What you mean by it is made quite plain in your writings. Dr Wiseman taught that the words 'This is my 'body' are to be understood as literally as the phrase, 'The Word *was* God' (**34**, 18). You teach exactly the same thing (**35**, 69). Like the Romanists, you teach that after the consecration of the bread, there is whole Christ, God, and Man present in or with it (**35**, 68).

33. Dr Wiseman maintained that the Jews were right when they understood the words of our Lord literally, when He spoke to them respecting eating His flesh and drinking His blood, and taught that 'If the phrase '*to eat the flesh* of a person, besides its 'literal sense bore a metaphorical signifi- 'cation, then it signified when used meta- 'phorically, to attempt to do him some 'serious injury, principally by calumny or 'false accusation. Such, therefore, was the 'only figurative meaning which the phrases 'could present to the audience at Ca- 'pharnaum. "While the wicked," says the 'Psalmist, "draw near against me to eat my 'flesh" (Ps. xxvii. 3). This expression, as 'commentators have marked, describes the 'violent rage of his enemies, and the lengths 'to which they were ready to go against 'him. Job xix. 22 is the same phrase, but 'spoken of calumniators. "Why do ye per- 'secute me, and are not satisfied with my 'flesh!" Again, Micheas iii. 3 we have, '"Who also eat the flesh of my people"' (**34**, 6).

34. You have enriched this novel and original criticism in its application to the eating of Christ's flesh by the addition of two or three texts by way of fuller illustration, you say, 'It were an unexplained and 'unexampled metaphor, that to eat His flesh 'were to believe in Him; the more so, since 'in that language such metaphor is only used 'of preying upon a person or one's self, or of 'calumniating. The metaphor is from wild 'beasts. Ps. xxvii. 2; Micah iii. 3, "Wh 'do ye persecute me, and are not satisfie 'with my flesh?" Job xix. 22, in the san 'sense as "Devour my people." Ps. xiv. 4 'Jer. x. 25, l. 17, "The poor." Prov. xx: '14, or he "Eateth his own flesh;" "preyet 'on himself," Eccles. iv. 5' (**35**, 71. Se section 273 below).

35. I will now point out to you some the most important passages in the writing of the Fathers, which in the plainest manne refute by anticipation your flagrant doctrin and which form no part of your testimony c the Fathers, and what makes it appear al the more strange, some of them have bee quoted against your doctrine during thousand years. I shall show too that som passages you have so garbled, mistranslated and glossed, as entirely to change thei character.

36. I shall begin first with a famous pas sage from Augustine. He writes (for it appears in one of his most carefully written works), 'If a form of speech is preceptive 'forbidding either a disgraceful thing or a 'crime, or commanding what is useful or 'beneficent, it is not figurative. But if it 'seems to command a disgraceful thing or 'a crime, or to forbid what is useful or 'beneficent, it is figurative. "Except ye 'eat," he says, "the flesh and drink the blood 'of the Son of Man, ye have no life in you." 'He seems to command a disgraceful thing 'or a crime, therefore it is figurative, com- 'manding us to communicate in the passion 'of the Lord, and sweetly and profitably to 'treasure up in our memory, that His flesh 'was crucified and wounded for us' (**21**, 13).

37. It appears to me remarkable that you have 'not knowingly omitted' this most important passage. The treatise of which it forms a part is but small, and you have quoted a passage from a preceding page, which had you 'given with so much of the 'context as was necessary for the clear 'exhibition of its meaning,' it would have been plainly seen that it was against, and not for, the purpose for which you quoted it. The words which immediately follow your quotation are these, 'And as soon as any 'one looks upon these observances [Baptism 'and the Lord's Supper] he knows to what 'they refer, and so reveres them not in car- 'nal bondage, but in spiritual freedom. 'Now, as to follow the letter, and to take 'signs for the things that are signified by 'them, is a mark of weakness and bondage' (**21**, 12). There is another passage in the same third book in close proximity to the passage which you have quoted, which is as follows:—'But the ambiguities of meta- 'phorical words, about which I am next to 'speak, demand no ordinary care and dili- 'gence. In the first place, we must beware 'of taking a figurative expression literally. 'For the saying of the apostle applies in this

'case too; "The letter killeth, but the Spirit 'giveth life." For when what is said figur-'atively is taken as if it were said literally, 'it is understood in a carnal manner. And 'nothing is more fittingly called the death 'of the soul than when that in it which 'raises it above the brutes, the intelligence, 'namely, is put in subjection to the flesh by 'a blind adherence to the letter' (21, 11).

38. But the first of the above passages from Augustine's small treatise on biblical interpretation is of historical importance, having been cited for more than a thousand years against the doctrine held by you. Paschasius, the first promulgator of your doctrine, like Dr Wiseman and you, understood and interpreted the eating of Christ's flesh and drinking of His blood literally, and not figuratively. Frudegard quoted the passage against the doctrine of Paschasius, and how he answered it, or rather failed to do so, his own writings testify (33, 18; viii., 9).

39. This same Paschasius presented the little book containing his heresy to Prince Charles, who employed Bertram, a monk of the same monastery of which Paschasius was the abbot, to answer it. The use which he made of the passage from Augustine is worthy of your notice. After quoting the words, he remarks, 'We see this doctor saith that the 'mystery of the body and blood of Christ is 'celebrated by the faithful under a figure; 'for carnally to receive His body and blood 'is not, he saith, an act of religion but a 'crime' (25, 18, 19). You know that this book of Bertram's was the chief means of leading first Bishop Ridley, and then Archbishop Cranmer, to give up the Paschasian or Roman Catholic doctrine of the real presence (x., 74). Moreover, you have some knowledge of the book, for you quote a passage from it, but by a wrong translation you make it appear that Bertram is speaking of the sign, whereas he is speaking of the thing signified, or the reality. The words '*sed 'ipsius veritatis nuda manifestatione*' you have translated 'but with a naked manifes-'tation of the mystery,' instead of 'but with 'the naked manifestation of the reality itself' (25, 2). How seriously you have perverted the teaching of Bertram, and, when perverted, applied to your own purpose I have shown in viii., 28, 29.

40. Rabanus Maurus, the leading divine of that century, wrote against Paschasius, and in his instruction to his clergy quotes the passage from Augustine as a key to find whether a passage in Holy Scripture is to be understood literally or figuratively (26, 30). Berengar, at a subsequent period, frequently quoted the same passage in his controversy with Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, the earliest leading defender of the heresy of Paschasius.

41. Strange as it may appear, the very words which Lanfranc used in defence of the Paschasian heresy you quote as the words of Augustine thus, 'S. Augustine again, as 'quoted in the sentences of Prosper, "We 'drink His blood *under* the form and flavour 'of wine"' (35, 33; viii., 73; ix., 139; x., 40).

42. As time passed on and the dark age of the Church became still darker, the words of Augustine were quoted as the sentiments of a heretic. Thus Fulbert, Bishop of Chartres, is represented as quoting the words of Augustine after the following manner: 'Except 'ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink 'His blood, ye have no life in you. He seems 'to command what is a disgraceful thing or 'a crime, therefore it is figurative *the heretic 'will say*, commanding us *only* to communi-'cate in the passion of the Lord, and sweetly 'and profitably to treasure up in our memory 'that His flesh was crucified and wounded 'for us' (viii., 51). It is most probable however, if not certain, that some Romanist interpolated the writings of Fulbert, and thus charged Augustine with heresy. Anyhow, it shows that if the doctrine of the real presence, as taught by Paschasius, Dr Wiseman, and yourself, is orthodox, the great Augustine, the most influential human authority in the early Church, was a heretic.

43. It is needless to dwell upon the fact of the oft quotation in question by the Reformers and subsequently by a long list of Protestant divines. I am not called upon to determine whether you omitted this most famous and well-known passage of Augustine knowingly or unknowingly. You affirm 'I 'have not knowingly omitted anything.' Admitting then that the omission of this famous passage, as well as of other equally important passages from the Fathers, arises from an insufficient knowledge of their writings, it well might be asked of what real value is your collected testimony of the Fathers for the purpose alleged?

44. The two following passages, either with or without your knowledge, form no part of your alleged testimony. 'Why make ready 'the teeth and belly? Believe and thou hast 'eaten' (21, 69). 'For to believe on him, 'this is to eat the living bread. He that be-'lieveth eateth' (21, 72). Berengar used these two passages with much force against the Paschasian heresy of the real presence, as maintained by Archbishop Lanfranc eight hundred years ago, and they were too well known to be ignored. Hence they have been assigned a place in the *Corpus Juris Canonici* of the Roman Catholic Church, and to render them as little harmless as possible to the Paschasian doctrine, they have been duly glossed; but notwithstanding the skill of the glosser, Augustine is allowed to teach that the very same things which the devout communicant receives spiritually in the sacrament he may receive by faith without the sacrament (ix., 161, 162). You can better

account for having omitted these two quotations, which are of such importance in the present controversy, than I can.

45. I shall now call your attention to a few of the chief passages in the writings of the Fathers in which in the most distinct manner possible they interpret in the sixth of St John figuratively what you and Dr Wiseman interpret literally, and directly contradict your doctrine.

46. Tertullian states, 'Now, because they 'thought His discourse was harsh and intole- 'rable, supposing that He had really and 'literally enjoined on them to eat His flesh, 'He, with the view of ordering the state of 'salvation as a spiritual thing, set out with 'the principle, "It is the spirit that quick- 'eneth," and then added, "The flesh pro- 'fiteth nothing,"—meaning, of course, to the 'giving of life. He also goes on to explain 'what he would have us to understand by '*spirit:* "The words that I speak unto you 'they are spirit, and they are life." In a 'like sense He had previously said, "He 'that heareth my words, and believeth on 'Him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and 'shall not come into condemnation, but shall 'pass from death unto life." Constituting, 'therefore, His word as the life-giving prin- 'ciple, because that word is spirit and life, 'He likewise called His flesh by the same 'appellation; because, too, the word had 'become flesh, we ought therefore to desire 'Him in order that we may have life, and to 'devour Him with the ear, and to ruminate 'on Him with the understanding, and to 'digest Him by faith' (10, 6). You have made extracts from this author which occupy about six octavo pages, not a word of which answers your purpose, but had this quotation formed a part of your patristic testimony, it would have been ruinous to your carnal interpretation of the sixth of St John.

47. Equally destructive of that interpretation are the following extracts from Origen, which, had they formed a part of your 400 pages of extracts from the Fathers, it would have been seen plainly that they by no means serve the purpose for which you have made them.

48. Origen states, 'When "the Jews strove 'among themselves, saying, How can this 'man give us His flesh to eat?" we show 'that they were not so foolish as to suppose 'that when saying these things He invites 'the hearers to come and to eat His flesh' (11, 3). This most distinguished of all the Fathers, in the most direct manner possible contradicts Dr Wiseman's and your interpretation. You both contend that the Jews were right in understanding our Lord's words literally, but Origen does not believe the Jews themselves so understood Him, and there is much to be said in favour of his view (vii. 31).

49. You quote a passage from a homily of Origen, but for what purpose I cannot conceive (11, 24), while you suppress a well-known passage in the same homily commonly quoted against your doctrine. In that homily Origen states, 'Our Lord and Saviour says, '"Except ye eat my flesh and drink my 'blood, ye have no life in you, for my flesh 'is meat indeed, and my blood is drink 'indeed." Because Jesus, therefore, is altogether and wholly clean; His whole flesh 'is food, and His whole blood is drink; 'because every work of His is holy, and 'every word of His is true. And therefore 'His flesh is true food, and His blood is true 'drink. For with the flesh and blood of 'His own word, as with clean food and 'drink, He gives drink to, and recruits the 'whole race of men. In the second place, 'after the flesh of Him, Peter is clean food, 'and Paul and all the apostles. . . . Acknowledge that they are figures, the things which 'are written in the inspired Book, and therefore as spiritual and not as carnal persons, 'examine and understand what is said; for 'if, as carnal persons, you understand them, 'they injure and do not nourish you. For 'there is also in the Gospel a letter which 'kills; a killing letter is not found in the 'Old Testament alone. There is also in the 'New Testament a letter which kills him 'who does not understand spiritually the 'things which are spoken. For if, according 'to the letter, thou followest the very thing 'which is said, "Except ye eat my flesh 'and drink my blood," this letter kills' (11, 28, 29). Here Origen, as well as Augustine and Tertullian, in the very plainest manner refute your doctrine. The natural inference is that for that reason you have suppressed them but the acconnt of your own performance forbids such a conclusion.

50. I come now to a passage in the writings of Origen, which you have quoted, and as quoted by you, if the words are to be understood literally, might, after a very obscure manner, seem to teach your doctrine. You affirm, 'I have given every passage, as far as 'as in me lay, with so much of the context 'as was necessary for the clear exhibition of 'its meaning' (section 29 above). But in regard to this passage you *have suppressed* 'so much of the context as was necessary 'for the clear exhibition of its meaning,' you have translated a part of the passage after a manner which I forbear to characterize, and have helped the translation by a deceptive gloss. In my copy, what here follows forms one section or paragraph, and from it you have made two separate and independent quotations, which I have distinguished below by including them in square brackets in sections 52 and 54, following.

51. '"He shall not sleep till he eats the 'prey and drinks the blood of the wounded" '(Num. xxiii. 24). Who, on these words, 'will be so contentious an advocate of the

'historical narrative, yea, who is found so 'firm, who not alarmed at the sound of the 'letter, in necessity itself, takes refuge in the 'sweetness of the allegory? For how shall 'this people, so laudable, so great, of whom 'the Word of God narrates so great commen-'dations, come to this, that they drink the 'blood of the wounded? since, by such valid 'commands, the food of blood is prohibited 'by God, that even we, who have been 'called from the Gentiles, are necessarily 'commanded to abstain from those things 'which are sacrificed to idols, so also from 'blood. They may say therefore to us—

52. ['Who is that people who are accus-'tomed to drink blood? These were the 'things which, when in the Gospel also, 'those of the Jews who followed the Lord 'heard, they were offended and said: "Who 'can eat flesh and drink blood?" But the 'Christian people, the faithful people, heareth 'these things, and embraceth them, and fol-'loweth Him who saith: "Except ye eat 'my flesh and drink my blood, ye have no 'life in you; for my flesh is meat indeed, 'and my blood is drink indeed." And in 'truth, He who said these things was 'wounded for men, for "He was wounded 'for our sins," as Esaias saith. But we are 'said to drink the blood of Christ, not only* 'in the way (*ritu*) of Sacraments, but also 'when we receive His Word, in which '(*sermones in quibus*) is life, as also Himself 'saith, "The words which I speak unto you 'they are spirit and they are life."'

53. 'He therefore Himself hath been 'wounded, whose blood we drink, that is, 'we receive the words of His doctrine. But 'nevertheless they also have been wounded 'who have preached to us His Word, for we 'also read their words, that is, the words of 'His apostles, and we who are following the 'life which is from them, drink the blood of 'the wounded. Therefore he says, "He 'shall not sleep till he eats the prey." For 'this people, who are compared to the whelp 'of a lion, or to a lion, will not rest nor 'sleep until they seize the prey, that is, 'until they seize the kingdom of heaven; 'because "from the days of John the king-'dom of heaven suffereth violence, and the 'violent take it by force."

54. ['But that thou mayest more clearly 'understand that these things are written 'of our people, who are confederated in the 'sacraments of Christ; hear how in other 'places also Moses declares the like, saying: '"Butter of kine, and milk of sheep, with 'fat of lambs, and rams of the breed of 'Bashan, and goats, with the fat of kidneys 'of wheat; and wine they shall drink, the 'blood of the grape." And this then, which 'is called "the blood of the grape," is Blood 'of that grape which springs of that Vine, 'whereof the Saviour saith, "I am the true 'vine," the disciples "the branches," the 'Father "the husbandman," who purgeth 'them, that they may bring forth very much 'fruit. Thou, then, art the true people of 'Israel, which canst drink blood, and canst 'eat the Flesh of the Word of God and drink 'His blood, and canst suck up the Blood of 'that grape which is of the true vine, 'and of those branches which the Father 'purgeth.']

55. 'The fruit of which branches is de-'servedly called the blood of the wounded, 'which we drink from their words and 'doctrine; if, however, we are rising up as 'the whelps of a lion, and are skipping as a 'lion' (11, 34-36).

56. Out of many striking illustrations of the manner in which you have concocted your patristic testimony, this is one of the most noteworthy, and exhibits a very strik-ing contrast between your practice and theory (section 29). Do note well what you have omitted, and see how plainly Origen by anti-cipation repudiates your interpretation and that of Dr Wiseman respecting drinking the blood of Christ (section 53). But you have not only suppressed the plain teaching of Origen, viz., that the blood of Christ can be drunk by means of His words and those of His apostles, but by that suppression and a mistranslation, with the aid of a gloss, you have made it appear that Origen is referring to a sacramental participation only, whereas he is referring to a participation of the blood of Christ through the medium of His words. Thus by translating *sermones* (words) 'The 'Word,' and adding the gloss 'as we say, 'not only sacramentally but spiritually,' your readers, especially those of your school, would be led to infer that Origen is speaking of no other receiving of Christ's blood than in the Lord's Supper, and receiving it therein in a twofold way, one in the way of sacra-ments only, that is, the consecrated bread and wine, and the other in the sacraments, and spiritually also. It is true that your gloss may have another meaning. 'As we '(of the Church of England) say, not only 'sacramentally,' that is, receiving the blood of Christ through a right observance of the Lord's Supper, 'but spiritually,' that is, re-ceiving the very same thing through the words of Christ, apart from that holy ordi-nance. This is really what Origen means, and your gloss thus understood teaches, on the authority of Origen, that the very same blood which is devoutly received in the ob-servance or rite (*ritu*) of sacraments may also be received through Christ's words and those of His apostles without sacraments. This manner of quoting is so remarkable that it needs no further remark of mine.

57. The next Father that comes in chrono-logical order is Eusebius of Cæsarea, from whose writings I shall only give one very

(*'As we say, not only sacramentally but spiritu-ally.')

striking passage which has not been allowed to illuminate your patristic testimony, and I shall leave it to speak for itself. 'Having 'discussed these and such like things more 'mystically, some of His disciples said, "This 'is a hard saying, who can hear it?" To 'whom the Saviour answered, saying, "Doth 'this offend you? What, and if you shall 'see the Son of Man ascend up where He 'was before? It is the spirit that quickeneth; 'the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that 'I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they 'are life." By which words He instructed 'them to understand spiritually the words 'that He had spoken to them concerning 'flesh and blood; for you must not consider 'me to speak of the flesh which I carry about 'me, as if you were to eat that, nor suppose 'that I command you to drink sensible and 'corporal blood. But understand well that 'the words that I have spoken to you are 'spirit and life; so that His words and dis-'courses are the flesh and blood of which he 'who always partakes, as one fed upon 'heavenly food, shall be a partaker of 'heavenly life' (14, 6).

58. Cyril of Jerusalem plainly contradicts your interpretation of a part of the sixth of St John, and his teaching upon this point appears to have come within the extent of your knowledge, for you have with some care expelled it from a passage which you have quoted from an English translation of Cyril's lectures; and you have done it after this manner. You have quoted paragraph number three, which immediately precedes it, and paragraph number five, which immediately follows it, and as if to conceal the omission of the obnoxious paragraph number four, you have actually taken the liberty, in making your quotation, to change the figures of the paragraphs which you professedly quote. Thus you profess to quote three consecutive paragraphs numbered 4, 5, 6, but you really quote 3, 5, 6, and omit number 4, but conceal the omission by assigning that number to number 3. The paragraph omitted is—'4. Christ, on a certain occasion, dis-'coursing with the Jews, said, "Except ye 'eat my flesh and drink my blood, ye have 'no life in you." They not receiving 'this saying spiritually were offended, and 'went backward, supposing that He was 'inviting them to eat flesh' (15, 12).

59. An extract from the writings of Basil, which I will now give, is well worthy of a place in your patristic testimony, which either knowingly or unknowingly you have omitted. Commenting on the words, 'And he that 'eateth me even he shall live by me' (John vi. 57), he remarks, 'For we eat His flesh 'and drink His blood by being made partak-'ers through His incarnation and life of sense 'of the word and wisdom. For He called 'His whole mystical course and conversation 'on earth His flesh and blood, and signified 'by them that doctrine consisting of practi-'cal and natural and theological teaching, by 'which the soul is nourished and is prepared 'for the contemplation of things' (16, 9).

60. You have treated the testimony of Ambrose much after the same manner as you have treated that of Origen. A passage, which ought to have been given as one quotation, has been made into two independent quotations, and by 'suppressing so much of 'the context as was necessary to the clear 'exhibition of its meaning,' your readers are left to infer that in both quotations Ambrose is alluding to a reception of Christ in the sacrament, whereas it is certain that, in your second quotation, he is speaking of a reception of Christ apart from and independent of the sacrament. Ambrose, applying the words, 'Asher, his bread shall be fat, and 'he shall give food to princes' (Gen. xlix. 20), mystically to Christ, gives a twofold interpretation of them—one as receiving Christ in the sacrament, and the other as receiving Him apart from the sacrament. In regard to the first interpretation, he says, 'This 'bread He gave to the apostles to divide to 'the believing people.' Then referring to the consecration of the bread, he remarks, 'This bread then is become the food of saints.' That is the first interpretation. Coming to the second, he remarks, 'We too may under-'stand the Lord Himself who giveth His 'own flesh to us, as He Himself said, "I am 'the bread of life." If any were even 'dead, yet if he have received of my bread, 'he shall live for ever. For he receiveth who 'proveth himself, but whoso receiveth shall 'not die the sinner's death, for this bread is 'the remission of sins' (17, 2, 3).

61. Both of your quotations, when regarded in the light of the context and in their proper connection, do not support your doctrine, but are plainly repugnant thereto. The second interpretation determines the meaning of the first. It is plain that, according to Ambrose, the consecrated bread in the Lord's Supper is not really and truly Christ. If it were, why should he expressly distinguish that bread from Christ, as he plainly does in his twofold interpretation of the bread of Asher? In the second interpretation he plainly teaches that Christ, or the flesh of Christ, may be received unto life apart from the sacrament, and that doctrine is quite incompatible with your literal interpretation of the eating of Christ's flesh.

62. Elsewhere Ambrose asserts 'that the 'reading of the Holy Scriptures is life, the 'Lord witnesses, saying "The words which 'I speak unto you they are spirit and they 'are life"' (17, 17). This important sentiment you have either knowingly or not knowingly omitted from your testimony of the Fathers.

63. Jerome has uttered nearly the same sentiment, and it is refreshing to find it in

your patristic testimony. 'Since the flesh 'of the Lord is true food, and His blood is 'true drink, the spiritual meaning [of Eccl. 'iii. 13] is, that in this present life we have 'one only good, to feed on His flesh and drink 'His blood, not only in the mystery [the 'Eucharist], but also in the reading of Scrip-'tures. For the true food and drink which 'is derived from the Word of God is know-'ledge of the Scriptures' (18, 49).

64. Jerome elsewhere, or an accredited author under his name, says, 'We read the 'Holy Scriptures. I think, that the gospel is 'the body of Jesus, that the Holy Scriptures 'are His doctrine. And since He says, "He 'who doth not eat my flesh and drink my 'blood," although it also can be understood 'in the mystery [sacrament of the Lord's 'Supper]; yet more truly is the word of the 'Scriptures the body of Christ, and the 'divine doctrine is His blood' (18, 50). This passage you have neither given glossed nor unglossed.

65. I shall only give one more striking instance of omission on your part in relation to this point, and that shall be from Chrysostom, who on the words, 'It is the spirit that 'quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing' (John vi. 63), remarks, 'His meaning is, "Ye 'must hear spiritually what relateth to me, 'for he who heareth carnally is not profited, 'nor gathereth any advantage." . . . They 'ought to have understood the matter mysti-'cally and spiritually' (22, 14).

66. Your doctrine and that of Dr Wiseman, whom you so closely follow, viz., that the words of Christ in the sixth of St John, respecting eating His flesh and drinking His blood, are to be understood literally and not figuratively, and that eating and drinking must be also sacramental, is plainly repugnant to the unanimous teaching of the Fathers. It is true your 400 pages of extracts from them contain but little evidence, in fact none, according to your own account, upon this point, and for a very plain reason; you have either suppressed it, or so quoted passages which do contain it as to make it appear that they do not contain it.

67. I come now to another distinct class of omissions, which are more fatal to your alleged patristic testimony than those already adduced. Your 400 pages of extracts from the Fathers are presented to your readers in the most disjointed manner possible, and to those who have but little or no knowledge of the writings of the Fathers, which is the case with the great majority of your readers, not excepting those of your own school, your heterogeneous extracts must give a very incorrect conception of the real character of those distinguished men. You ought at least to have laid down some necessary rules for your readers, to enable them to reduce to something like order and intelligence the chaos of language and sentiment contained in your 400 pages of extracts, culled out of more than as many volumes. Some rules are necessary for the guidance alike of misinformed Protestants, as well as of Romanising Churchmen. In endeavouring to come to a right understanding of the teaching of the Fathers in relation to the Lord's Supper, I have observed some such rules as the following:—

68. (1) There must be some fixed principles of quotation from the voluminous writings of the Fathers of what relates to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Their real opinions must be obtained, not from half-a-dozen sentences, not easily explained from as many folio volumes, but from their plainer and more numerous statements, and the latter and not the former must be understood to express their real opinions.

69. (2) The question is, whether the early Fathers did teach the doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements, not whether they were right or wrong in their interpretation and use of Holy Scripture.

70. (3) As it is universally admitted that during the first eight centuries there was no controversy concerning the Real Presence, as now maintained by some, it is not to be expected that there could be any formal or direct denial of it, and the evidence against it could not be otherwise than indirect.

71. (4) As the doctrine in question is of so simple and solemn a nature, and of such fundamental importance, words, phrases, illustrations, and arguments used in relation to the consecrated elements which appear to derogate from their supposed exalted sanctity as containing the body, soul, and divinity of Christ, are proofs against the doctrine.

72. (5) It is not to be assumed without proof, especially in relation to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, that Fathers contradict Fathers, and that every Father contradicts himself.

73. (6) The real sentiments of the Fathers are to be obtained, not from their highly rhetorical and figurative language, interpreted literally as plain statements, but from their plain, sober, and unadorned language.

74. (7) There were many reasons why some of the Fathers, when commending the observance of the Lord's Supper to the faithful, should speak of it in an inflated style and exaggerate its ceremonial, but there could be no reasons why they should apparently disparage that holy ordinance by laying aside their figures of speech and speaking of it in plain and sober language; therefore their sober and more moderate statements are to be taken as expressing their real opinions, rather than their adorned and rhetorical ones, so that their true sentiments respecting the nature of the Lord's Supper are rather to be obtained from their weakest

than from their strongest statements respecting it.

75. (8) The words and phrases used by any Father in relation to the Lord's Supper, must, if possible, be interpreted from his own writings or the writings of contemporary Fathers, before any other source of interpretation be resorted to.

76. In the very nature of things some rules are required in order to a right understanding of your long list of quotations from the writings of the Fathers, which appear not as links in a chain, but as diversified beads on a string. Now had you laid down some rules with a due regard to the nature and character of your quotations, your readers would have had the means of forming something like a consistent and intelligent conception of your patristic testimony, and they would have been in a position to see of what little worth it is for the purpose for which you have adduced it. I will not lay much stress upon this your omission, for I have now to call your attention to a much more serious omission with which you may be most justly charged.

77. You have, whether designedly or undesignedly, omitted certain parts of the writings of the Fathers, which had you not omitted, your list of extracts would have been interspersed with a number of luminaries, by the light of which your readers would have seen that even those passages of the Fathers which you have quoted fairly, by no means serve the purpose for which you quoted them.

78. In supplying this fatal omission of yours, I shall again begin with Augustine. In his treatise entitled *Christian Doctrine*, we have probably the first attempt of a Christian author to frame rules for biblical interpretation. Now had you quoted the two passages already noticed in sections 36, 37 above, and given another passage which you have quoted 'with as much of the context as 'was necessary for the clear exhibition of its 'meaning,' your patristic testimony would have been rendered worthless for your purpose, and especially in so far as you have alleged it in proof of a literal interpretation of the eating and drinking of the flesh and blood of Christ. But this would have appeared even yet more evident if those striking passages relating to this point, and already noticed, had gleamed as luminaries here and there in your list of quotations.

79. You cannot but know how very plainly Augustine has explained the nature and use of signs or sacraments, and sacramental language generally, yet essential as this kind of information is to a right understanding of the sacramental language of the Fathers, and of Augustine's in particular, it forms little or no part of your extracts from the Fathers. I will now supply a portion of your omissions, by which it will appear how seriously defective your patristic testimony is in a very important if not in an essential point.

80. (1) Augustine says, 'Signs which 'when they appertain to divine things, are 'called sacraments' (**21**, 1).

81. (2) 'A sacrament is a sign of a sacred 'thing' (**21**, 28).

82. (3) 'Because all things which represent 'other things, appear in a certain manner '(*quodammodo*) to sustain the characters of 'those things which they signify, as it is 'said by the apostle "That rock was Christ," 'since the rock of which this was spoken 'signified Christ' (**21**, 31).

83. (4) 'Nor may it be denied that some-'times the thing which signifies receives the 'name of that thing which it signifies. . . . 'For so also was the rock called Christ, be-'cause it signified Christ' (x. 28).

84. (5) Scripture is wont to speak, calling 'the things signifying as if they were the 'things signified' (**21**, 100).

85. (6) Augustine wishing to prove to a Manichæan that the words 'The blood is the 'life' (Deut. xii. 23), must be interpreted figuratively and not literally, says, 'For of 'that which is written, that the blood of an 'animal is its life, beside that which I have 'said above, that what is argued concerning 'the life of an animal does not concern me. 'I can expound that precept to consist in a 'sign; for [the Lord hesitated not to say, '"This is my body," when He gave a sign 'of His body]. . . . For the blood was so 'life as the rock was Christ. Thus the 'apostle says, "For they drank of that rock 'which followed them, and that rock was 'Christ." But it is known that the children 'of Israel drank water of the smitten rock 'in the wilderness, of whom the apostle 'spoke when he said these things; he did 'not, however, say the rock signified Christ, 'but said the rock was Christ. Which 'again, that it might not be taken carnally, 'he calls it spiritual; that is, he teaches 'that it should be understood spiritually' (**21**, 35, 36).

86. (7) 'What is that which forbidding to 'eat blood says, "The life of all flesh is its 'blood" (Lev. xvii. 11). . . . It remains, 'therefore, that since that mediator, who in 'all those sacrifices offered for sins was pre-'figured, makes an atonement for our life; 'that may be called life which signifies life. 'A thing which is a sign is accustomed to be 'called by the name of the thing which it 'signifies; as it is written, "The seven ears 'are seven years," for he did not say they '"signify seven years," "and the seven kine 'are seven years," and many things of this 'kind. Hence there is that which is said, '"The rock was Christ." For he did not 'say the rock signified Christ," but, as it 'were, was this very thing, though indeed 'it was not this in substance, but in signi-'fication. So also the blood, because on

'account of a certain vital substantiality it 'signifies the life, is in sacraments called the 'life. . . . Modes of speech also must be 'considered by that which contains being 'used for that which is contained, that since 'life is held in the body by blood, for if it is 'shed it departs, by it life may be more suit-'ably signified, and blood takes its name. 'As the place in which the church is 'assembled is called a church (Eph. v. 27; '1 Cor. xi. 22). It is also written, "He 'sheddeth blood who withdraweth the hire 'of the labourer" (Eccles. xxxiv. 24 or 27). 'He called blood hire, since in it life is sus-'tained, which is called by the name of 'blood' (21, 23).

87. (8) ['They (sacraments) receive for the 'most part the names even of the things 'themselves. As, therefore, after a certain 'manner (*quemdam modum*), the sacrament of 'the body of Christ is the body of Christ, 'the sacrament of the blood of Christ is the 'blood of Christ, so the sacrament of faith is 'faith.] As speaking of baptism itself, the 'apostle says, "We are buried with Christ 'by baptism into death." He does not say, 'We signify burial, but He says outright, '"We are buried." Therefore the sacra-'ment of so great a thing He called by no 'other name than that of the thing itself' (21, 3).

88. Of the above eight extracts from the writings of Augustine you have only quoted a portion of the sixth extract and a portion of the eighth, and your quotations are there distinguished by square brackets. You have then either knowingly or unknowingly suppressed the very parts of Augustine's writings, in which he explains the nature and meaning of signs or sacraments, and symbolical or sacramental language. Most, if not all, of these passages have been quoted by our English Reformers, and especially by Bishop Jewel in the interpretation of such sacramental language as, 'this is my body,' 'this is my blood,' which in their judgment refuted the doctrine of the real presence as founded by Roman Catholics and by you, upon these words. If you have not knowingly omitted those well-known passages from Augustine, one cannot help conjecturing that had you known of them, how very different would have been your collection of extracts from the Fathers from what it is, especially in regard to its bulk. You would have seen that those passages which contain the sacramental language of the Fathers, where, to use the words of Theodoret, 'The visible 'symbols are honoured with the title of body 'and blood' (section 131 below), or the words of Augustine, 'the thing which signifies 'receives the name of that which it signi-'fies,' are no evidence in favour of your doctrine of the real presence, and thus by far the greater part of your alleged testimony would have been seen even by yourself to be worse than useless. In fact, Augustine's interpretation of sacramental language, and his figurative interpretation of the language of our Lord respecting eating His flesh and drinking His blood, as well as that of the Fathers generally, quashes your alleged patristic testimony as evidence of your doctrine of the real presence.

89. It will not do for you to assume that Augustine's key to the interpretation of sacramental language has no application to the interpretation of the phrases, 'This is my 'body,' 'This is my blood,' for he himself so applies it, or rather he uses those very phrases as figurative forms of speech to illustrate other figurative forms of speech. The very words quoted by you from Augustine, viz., 'The Lord hesitated not to say, '"This is my body," when He gave a sign of 'His body,' were used for that very purpose. This will appear certain by an examination of so much of the 'context as is necessary for 'the clear exhibition of its meaning,' which you appear, contrary to your own statement, not to have done.

90. It will be seen from the sixth extract, as given above (section 85), that Augustine is disputing with a Manichæan who maintained that the words 'The blood is the 'life' is a literal form of expression, whereas Augustine contends that it is a figurative form, and in proof that in Holy Scripture such forms of speech are used, he adduces the language of our Lord, that when He gave a sign of His body He said of the sign, 'This is my body.' He adduces, for the same purpose, the instance of St Paul who, instead of saying the rock signified Christ, which was what he really meant, he said 'The Rock was Christ.' You will do well to feel the force of Augustine's argument. The Manichæan affirmed that blood is the life, Augustine denied that blood was life, and maintained that from that form of expression blood was no more life than the bread which Christ gave to His disciples was His body, although He said, 'This is my 'body,' than the rock in the wilderness was Christ, although St Paul said, 'The Rock 'was Christ.'

91. You, with Dr Wiseman, teach that the words 'This is my body,' so far from being a figurative form of expression, are to be understood as literally as the words, 'The Word 'was with God, the Word was God' (section 32 above); you cannot fail to see how widely you both differ from Augustine.

92. But Augustine has said still more upon this point, which you will do well to consider. In the seventh extract from his writings, as given above (section 86), he states that blood may be called life because it signifies the life, and adds, 'a thing which 'is a sign is accustomed to be called by the 'name of the thing which it signifies, &c.' It is not necessary to re-quote the passage.

There he adduces a series of additional forms of figurative expressions.

93. Whether Augustine was right or wrong in regarding the phrase 'Blood is life' as a figurative form of expression is of no consequence to us. That he believed it to be so, is quite certain, and it is just as certain that he considered a number of other passages of Scripture to be figurative forms of expression, and among these forms he includes the phrase 'This is my body.' To all of these forms he gives the same kind of interpretation, viz., 'A thing which is a sign is accustomed to 'be called by the name of the thing which it 'signifies.' A material rock is called Christ, ears of corn are called years, kine are called years, and bread is called body, not that any of them are really what they are called, but as signs are called by the names of the things which they signify. In the belief of Augustine, sacramental bread was not really the body of Christ, but called by the name of body, for a thing which is a sign is accustomed to be called by the name of the thing which it signifies.

94. You perhaps will know that I am not making any novel use of this part of Augustine's writings. I am rather inclined to think that you very much underrate the extent of your knowledge in regard to many parts of the writings of the Fathers, and the use which has been made of those parts in the refutation of the very doctrine of the real presence as believed and taught by you. What use has been made by our Reformers of the above teaching of Augustine, you will see from what here follows.

95. Ridley, Bishop and Martyr, who was burnt alive for refusing to believe your doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements, writes, 'After this manner of speech, St Augustine 'teacheth in his question in Leviticus and 'against Adimantus' (sections 85, 86 above). 'It is said in Scripture, that "seven ears of 'corn be seven years," and "the rock was 'Christ," and "blood is the soul," the which 'last saying (saith Augustine in his book 'against Adimantus) is understanded to be 'spoken in a sign or figure, for the Lord 'Himself did not stick to say, "This is my 'body," when He gave the sign of His body.' *A Brief Declaration of the Lord's Supper*, Works, pp. 41, 42.

96. Hooper, Bishop and Martyr, 'I would 'allege for my purpose St Augustine, who 'understandeth and expounded one way, 'and by one figure and trope, these two texts, '"The rock was Christ," and "This is my 'body," saving that our faith is not grounded 'upon St Augustine or any other man, but 'upon the Word of God, the only Scripture; 'and also because I mind hereafter to declare 'the judgment of Augustine and other of 'the holy Fathers concerning this matter, 'because they make with the old truth 'against this new Papistry.'—*Answer to the Bishop of Winchester's Book*, Works, vol. i. p. 127.

97. Becon, Chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer, writes, 'And St Austin, rehearsing 'divers sentences which were spoken figuratively, numbereth among them these words 'of Christ, "This is my body," whereby he 'declareth plainly that Christ spake these 'words figuratively, not meaning that the 'bread was His body by substance, but by 'signification.'—*The Displaying of the Popish Mass*, Works, vol. iii. p. 271.

98. Harding, a Roman Catholic priest, in answer to Bishop Jewel, writes as follows:— 'The like answer may be made to the objection brought out of St Augustine, "Our 'Lord sticked not to say, This is my body, 'when, notwithstanding, He gave the sign of 'His body." For this is to be considered 'that St Augustine, in fighting against the 'Manichees, oftentimes useth not his own 'sense and meaning, but those things which 'by some mean, howsoever it were, might 'seem to give him advantage against them, 'so as he might put them to the worst.'—*Works of Jewel*, vol. ii. p. 612.

99. To that Jewel rejoins, 'Certainly St 'Augustine, for his mildness and sobriety, 'both in disputation, and also otherwise, 'hath the praise above all others. Neither 'doth there appear in that whole book 'against Adimantus any token to the 'contrary. Some part of their variance 'grew upon occasion of these words, "The 'blood is the soul." For declaration 'whereof St Augustine, without any manner heat of contention that may appear, 'saith thus: "So is the blood the soul, even 'as the rock was Christ." And in the same 'chapter he joineth these three sentences 'altogether, "The blood is the soul," "The 'rock was Christ," and "This is my body," 'as being all both of like meaning, and also 'of like manner of utterance. St Augustine 'never knew any of these of M. Harding's 'lately invented holy forms, or coverts, or 'secrecies. But in most plain wise he saith, '"Christ gave a token of His body;" agreeing therein both with himself and also 'with all other ancient Catholic Fathers.'—*Works*, vol. ii. p. 612.

100. You have quoted another part of Augustine's writings, but as regards the chief part of it, contrary to your own statement, you have not 'given it with so much 'of the context as was necessary for the 'clear exhibition of its meaning.' In the extract, section 87 above, as given from Augustine, what you have quoted I have given in square brackets, and what you have not quoted is not so distinguished. It is true, however, that what you have quoted is one instance out of many, which throws doubt upon the estimate which you have formed of your alleged patristic testimony,

'oncerning which you affirm, 'The follow-
'ing evidence that the belief in the real
'presence was part of the faith of Christians
'from the first, is more than enough to con-
'vince one who is willing to be convinced.
'If this convince not, neither would any
'other. There is no flaw, no doubt, I might
'almost say no loophole, except that man
'always finds one to escape what he is un-
'willing to accept' (section 28). So certain are you that your alleged testimony teaches your doctrine of the real presence. An essential part of that doctrine, as maintained by you is, that the words, 'this is my body,' is as literal a proposition as the words, 'the 'Word was God' (section 32 above). But you have quoted words from Augustine which plainly teach that in the same sense in which the sacrament (meaning the sacrament of Baptism) is faith, 'so the sacrament 'of the body of Christ is the body of Christ, 'the sacrament of the blood of Christ is the 'blood of Christ' (section 87 above). Now I ask you, is the proposition 'the sacrament of faith *is* faith' to be understood as literally as the proposition, 'the Word WAS God?' I presume you cannot say that it is. So no more are the phrases, 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood,' literal propositions. Nay, Augustine himself defines these propositions by a very marked qualification, 'as there-
'fore *after a certain manner* the sacrament
'of the body of Christ is the body of Christ,' &c. Augustine uses this qualifying phrase with other Latin Christian authors in contradiction to what is actual and real. How Augustine uses this qualifying phrase is best known from his writings, an instance is given in the extract from his works as quoted above (section 82). The following instances may be given:—'For
'the devil himself is the head of the wicked
'who are *in a certain manner* his body (21,
'17). When Christ commended His own
'body and blood, He took into His hands
'that which the faithful know, and *in a cer-*
'tain manner carried Himself when He said,
'"This is my body" (21, 49). The Word
'of God, which in words is opened to us
'daily, and *in a certain manner*, is broken,
'is daily bread' (21, 113). Christ is *in a*
'certain manner whole Christ in the fulness
'of the Church—that is, head and body,
'according to the fulness of a certain perfect
'man we all are members' (21, 114). In the very quotation which you yourself have made from Augustine there is a 'flaw,' 'doubt,' 'loophole,' or by whatever name you may call it, sufficient to render of no value your whole patristic testimony for the purpose you intended it.

101. I must now notice what you have not quoted 'which is necessary for the 'clear exhibition of the meaning' of that which you have quoted. Augustine goes on to state (see section 87 above), 'As speaking 'of Baptism itself, the Apostle says, "We 'are buried with Christ by baptism into 'death." He does not say, "We signify 'burial," but he says outright, "We are 'buried." Therefore the sacrament he called 'by no other name than that of the thing 'itself.' Here beyond all question Augustine understood St Paul as teaching that baptism *signified* death and burial, not that it really was so, nevertheless 'the sacrament 'of so great a thing he called by no other 'name than that of the thing itself.' The argument of Augustine is such that we are obliged to infer that what he has affirmed of the sacrament of Baptism, the same may be affirmed of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

102. I will quote for my own, if not for your satisfaction, what Cranmer, Bishop and Martyr, has said upon this part of Augustine's writings. After quoting the whole passage, he remarks, 'Hitherto I have re-
'hearsed the answer of St Augustine unto
'Boniface, a learned bishop, who asked of
'him how the parents and friends could
'answer for a young babe in baptism, and
'say in his person that he believeth and
'converteth unto God, when the child can
'neither do nor think any such things.
'Whereunto the answer of St Augustine is
'this, That forasmuch as baptism is the
'sacrament of profession of our faith, and of
'our conversion unto God, it becometh us so
'to answer for young children coming there-
'unto, as to the sacrament appertaineth,
'although the children indeed have no know-
'ledge of such things. And yet in our said
'answers we ought not to be reprehended as
'vain men or liars, forasmuch as in common
'speech we use daily to call sacraments and
'figures by the names of the things that be
'signified by them, although they be not the
'same things indeed. As every Good Friday,
'as often as it returneth from year to year,
'we call it the day of Christ's passion; and
'every Easter-day we call the day of His
'resurrection; and every day in the year we
'say that Christ is offered; and the sacra-
'ment of His body, we call it His body; and
'the sacrament of His blood, we call it His
'blood; and our baptism St Paul calleth
'our burial with Christ. And yet in very
'deed Christ never suffered but once, never
'arose but once, never was offered but once,
'nor in very deed in baptism we be not
'buried, nor the sacrament of Christ's body
'is not His body, nor the sacrament of His
'blood is not His blood. But so they be
'called because they be figures, sacraments,
'and representations of the things them-
'selves, which they signify, and whereof
'they bear the names. Thus doth St Augus-
'tine most plainly open this matter in his
'epistle to Bonifacius.' Cranmer then goes on to express the very same sentiments concerning the extracts from Augustine, as

given in sections 85, 86, above, as those expressed by Bishop Ridley, Bishop Hooper, Becon, and Bishop Jewel, as quoted above. —*Works of Cranmer*, vol. i. pp. 124, 125.

103. Becon, after quoting the passage from Augustine, remarks, 'Of these words of St 'Austin it manifestly appeareth, that the 'sacraments are called by the names of those 'things whereof they be sacraments; as the 'sacrament of faith, which is baptism, is 'called faith. And the sacrament of Christ's 'body and blood is called the body and 'blood of Christ, not that they be the things 'themselves, but they be so called, because 'they be figures, sacraments, and repre-'sentations of the things which they signify, 'and whereof they bear the names.—*Works*, vol. ii. p. 283.

104. Whether Augustine is right or wrong concerning answer being made for helpless infants and baptism being to them what he represents it, does not in the least affect the present question. Augustine plainly teaches that the sacrament of Christ's body is no more really Christ's body, the sacrament of Christ's blood is no more really Christ's blood, than the sacrament of baptism is death and burial. Strange as it may appear, you admit, and in fact teach, that a sacrament may be called by the name of the thing which it signifies, while it is not really the thing itself. This appears in your exposition of the sacramental language of Cyril of Jerusalem, which I will here quote. '"Be-'ware," he says, "of supposing this to be '*mere* ointment." *Before* consecration, it 'was *simple* ointment; so also the "bread 'of the Eucharist" was *mere* bread. *After* 'consecration, "the bread is *mere* bread no 'longer;" and "this holy ointment," he says, '"is no more *simple* ointment," but "the 'bread is the body of Christ," and "the 'chrism is Christ's gift of grace." Yet it 'was not the chrism *itself* which was Christ's 'gift of grace. It was but the instrument 'and vehicle of it. He calls the chrism by 'the name of the grace which it conveys' (**35**, 37).

105. Here you substantially interpret the sacramental language of Cyril in regard to the sacrament, mystery or sign, of chrism, according to the rules laid down by Augustine. Now, I ask, why do you not interpret his sacramental language in regard to the sacrament, mystery, or sign of Christ's body, after the same manner? If you had done so, it would have been as follows:—'Yet it was 'not the bread (no longer *mere* bread but 'consecrated) *itself* which was Christ's body. 'It was but the instrument and vehicle of it. 'He calls the consecrated bread by the name 'of the body which it conveys.'

106. As the flesh or body of Christ can be received in the sense Christ intended through the medium of His word in order to life, so the same body or flesh, in the sense intended, can be received through the medium of th sacrament, or mystery, in order to the hav ing of life more abundantly. But in eithe case by faith only.

107. It is needless to remark that the sac rament of chrism, though no sacrament o Scripture, was one of the early Church What we designate as two sacraments, the designated as four, viz., 'Baptism and Chrism 'Body and Blood, are sacraments of th 'Church' (**26**, 18). As in our Church on definition equally applies to both sacraments so in the early Church one definition equall applied to all four.

108. I have reserved for the last a very important canon of Scripture interpretatio as laid down by Augustine, and which form no part of your *catena patrum*. He says:—

'Brethren,—I must tell you and teach yo 'according to my poor abilities, which th 'Lord giveth me for your benefit, and must 'convey to you what you may hold as a rul 'in the interpretation of all Scripture. Every 'thing that is said or done is to be under-'stood either in its proper literal signification 'or else it signifies something figuratively, o 'at least, contains both of these at once, 'both its own literal interpretation and a 'figurative signification also. Thus I have 'set forth three things; examples of them 'must now be given, and from whence but 'from the Holy Scriptures. It is said, in its 'literal acceptation, that the Lord suffered, 'that He rose again, and ascended into hea-'ven; that we shall rise again at the end of 'the world, that we shall reign with Him 'for ever, we do not despise Him. Take 'all this as spoken literally, and look not 'out for figures; as it is expressed, so it 'really is. And so also with divers actions. 'The apostle went up to Jerusalem to see 'Peter, the apostle actually did this, it actu-'ally too place, it was an action peculiar too 'himself. It is a fact which he tells you; a 'simple fact according to its literal meaning.

109. '"The stone which the builders re-'fused is become the Head of the corner" is 'spoken in a figure. If we take "the stone" 'literally, what stone did the builders refuse 'which became the Head of the Corner? 'If we take "the stone" literally, of what 'corner is this *stone* become the Head? If we 'admit that it was figuratively expressed, 'and take it figuratively, the corner-stone is 'Christ; the Head of the Corner is the Head 'of the Church. . . .

110. 'Ye have heard an instance of a literal 'expression, as "that we shall rise again"; 'of a literal action, as that, according as it 'is said, "Paul went up to Jerusalem to see 'Peter." "The stone which the builders 'refused" is a figurative expression. There 'is now due to your expectation an example 'made out of both together, something which 'is at once a literal fact, and which also sig-'nifies something else figured by it. "We

know that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free woman;" this was literally a fact, not only a story, but a fact; are you looking for that which was figured in it? "These are the two Testaments"' (21, 128-130).

111. Here you see Augustine explicitly states that *all* Scripture must be interpreted by these three rules. You will do well to inquire by which of them he would interpret the expressions, 'This is my body which is 'given for you.' 'This cup is the New Testa-'ment in my blood, which is shed for you.' You, with Dr Wiseman, regard them as literal expressions. You teach that 'this is 'my body' is as literal as the phrase 'The 'word was God' (section 32 above), and, doubtless, you would not regard the phrase, 'This is my blood' as less literal. You must then, according to Augustine's first rule, 'take all this as spoken in the proper 'sense, and look not out for figures; as it is 'expressed, so it really is. . . . They are 'facts which He tells you; simple facts, ac-'cording to their literal meaning.' When it is borne in mind that our blessed Lord's living body was given to be slain, and that the shed blood was that of His body not alive, the first as well as all subsequent celebrations involve the actual dying of Christ, it would be an insult to the memory of Augustine, as well as contrary to his plain teaching, to charge him with interpreting the words of institution by his first rule.

112. Augustine could only interpret the words of institution *figuratively* and not literally, that is, 'This is my body, this is 'my blood' is 'spoken in a figure.' Augustine never said 'This is my body' is as literal a form of expression as 'The Word 'was God,' but he has said, 'The Lord hesi-'tated not to say "This is my body" when 'He gave a sign of His body' (section 83 above).

113. The third rule is both literally and figuratively, and the words of institution interpreted by this rule would be to this effect —'This is my body,' 'This is my blood,' are literal facts, and which also signify something else figured by them. Roman Catholics appear to follow this rule, or rather, this rule better than the first accords with their interpretation of the words of institution (ix. 140, 141; x. 65, 66).

114. Before turning to another point, I cannot but remind you that from your having only quoted two small portions of the above eight extracts from Augustine (sections 80-87), and those two portions not 'given 'with so much of the context as was neces-'sary for the clear exhibition of their mean-'ing,' your patristic testimony is rendered comparatively worthless. If you have 'not 'knowingly omitted them,' it is surpassing strange, for most of them have been cited against the Paschasian doctrine of the real presence for a thousand years, and so commonly were all of them quoted by our Reformers that they might almost be said to be hackneyed. Had the above extracts from the writings of Augustine, and many other such like from him and other Fathers, formed a just portion of your *catena*, it would have appeared, even to the ordinary reader, preposterous for you to suspend your doctrine upon such a chain. But those and such like passages from the Fathers are the key of interpretation to their sacramental language, and your not knowing of that key, or knowing of it, yet discarding it, has hindered you from entering into their interpretation, and having published their words and phrases in relation to the Lord's Supper without their key of interpretation, you do not enter into their meaning, and hinder from entering those who in confidence accept your patristic testimony for what you affirm it to be.

115. These remarks apply to the extent of your knowledge at the time you published your list of extracts from the Fathers, and accepting your affirmation 'I have suppressed 'nothing, I have not knowingly omitted any-'thing,' it is fair to suppose that the very important teaching of Augustine concerning the nature and interpretation of sacraments and sacramental language had not really come within the range of your knowledge, but very soon after your notoriously defective list of extracts from the Fathers was well supplied by Dean Goode. While you were using your utmost ingenuity to defend the doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements as held by Archdeacon Denison, 'before,' to use your own words, 'this fundamental doc-'trine might be disputed before a legal tri-'bunal' (35, 41), Dean Goode was with honest intent, sound learning, and perfectly fair quotations from the Fathers, 'vindicat-'ing the true doctrine of the real presence in 'opposition to the fictitious real presence 'asserted by Archdeacon Denison and Mr '(late Archdeacon) Wilberforce.' You say truly, 'On the other main subject, the belief 'of the Fathers, Mr Goode's work is chiefly 'directed against that of the late Archdeacon 'Wilberforce, and only incidentally against 'mine' (35, 45). But, nevertheless, he did really and truly, although incidentally and by anticipation, demonstrate that your extracts from the Fathers were worthless for the purpose for which you made them.

116. Now, I very much wish you to be deeply impressed with the real character of the answer which you made to Dean Goode in regard to the evidence which he adduced from the Fathers, and more especially from Augustine, concerning the nature of sacraments and sacramental language. To impress upon you the unworthy character of your answer, I shall only notice a few words of it,

and shall use the writings of Dean Goode to supply the rest.

117. You say, 'For if that maxim of Al-'bertinus and the school of Calvin were true 'that "the signs are called by the names of 'the things signified"' (35, 52). Here you designate the plain and certain teaching of Augustine as adduced by Dean Goode, which is substantially the same as that recorded in sections 80-87 above, 'the maxim of the 'school of Calvin.' You do not in plain Saxon call the maxim a lie, but in a more subtle manner you say, 'IF it were true.' It is notorious that if there is one great Protestant author hated more than all others, both by Romanists and those of your own school, that author is Calvin. And so you designate the teaching of your own recognised authorities, viz., the Fathers, and in effect the teaching of our Blessed Lord and His holy apostles, *a maxim of the school of Calvin*. You must be troubled with a very short memory, for the maxim you would confine to the school of Calvin, and in effect deny its truth, you yourself have actually made use of in the exposition of a sacrament of the early Church, as noticed in section 104 above. What you are pleased to call the maxim of the school of Calvin in regard to the interpretation of all sacramental signs is as old as the Scriptures; your maxim of interpreting the sacramental signs of the Lord's Supper essentially different from other sacramental signs, is peculiar to the school of Paschasius. For as 'Jubal was the father of all such as 'handle the harp and the organ,' so Paschasius, who lived in the ninth century, is the father of all such as handle the sacramental signs of the Lord's Supper after your fashion, viz., regarding the signs as being or containing the things of which they are the signs, that whoever receive the signs, whether saints or sinners, receive with them also the things signified (ix. 13-16; x. 59).

118. I beg now to call your attention, as I promised, to Dean Goode's reply to the very unworthy answer which you made respecting the evidence which he adduced from the Fathers concerning sacramental signs, &c. He says, 'I think it well to add, before I 'conclude, some observations on the adverse 'criticism that has been put forth from some 'quarters on my work on the Eucharist. 'With the exceptions of the incomplete work 'of Dr Pusey on the subject, none that I 'have seen appear to have any other object 'in view than that of misrepresenting and 'discrediting the work, an object easy to 'accomplish, in any case, with those readers 'who look only to the works published on 'their own side of the question. And as 'such readers form a large proportion of those 'who read at all, such productions often 'answer their purpose and accomplish their intended end. Dr Pusey's work is only a fragment of his intended and promised 'answer, and leaves some of the most im-'portant points in the controversy untouched. 'But it may be well that I should at once 'offer a few remarks on the matters he has 'taken up."

119. You have not forgotten, perhaps, to what the good Dean alludes in the two instances above. Before entering upon your answer to him, you remark, 'It was my in-'tention, in addition to the chapters here 'published, to have written three chapters '(1) to vindicate the literal interpretation of 'our blessed Lord's words, "This is my 'body;" (2) to maintain the belief of the 'Fathers in the real objective presence; (3) 'to contrast our English articles on the 'sacraments with the confessions of the 'Zwinglian or Calvinistic bodies. But the 'effort, in the midst of my other duties, to 'complete this vindication of my belief as a 'member and a priest of the English Church 'before the trial of Archdeacon Denison 'should be concluded, has involved a strain 'under which my health, for the time, if it 'so please God, has so far suffered that it 'becomes a duty to desist. . . . Of the sub-'jects which I am now compelled to delay, 'the only argument against the literal inter-'pretation of our Lord's words, &c. . . . 'Mr Goode, in his chapter on the Fathers, 'has addressed himself, not so much to the 'consideration of what the Fathers say 'directly on the real objective presence, as 'to prove that they believe certain other 'things, which he holds to be inconsistent 'with that belief. These I hope to consider, 'when it shall please God to give me health' (35, 42, 43, 46).

120. These, your declared intentions and purposed considerations, were published twenty years ago, and were then made contingent upon God giving you health, and as they have not yet been carried into effect, it is presumed you have not yet attained the requisite health. I have no doubt you know as well as I do, that it is impossible for you to answer Dean Goode. Excuse this digression from the Dean, who goes on to say,

121. 'In my work on the Eucharist, I 'have so fully discussed all the various points 'connected with the subject, and Dr Pusey's 'reply is so far from any attempt to meet my 'arguments and authorities as a whole, even 'on the points he has noticed, that to give 'the reader any idea of the strength of the 'case against Dr Pusey would necessitate the 'reproduction of the greater part of my 'work. I must request the reader, there-'fore, to compare our arguments and authori-'ties as given in our respective works, and 'shall content myself with a brief notice of 'those points in which Dr Pusey's statements 'might be likely to mislead him. One cau-'tion I would premise at the outset, and one 'of which I am convinced any thoughtful 'reader of Dr Pusey's works on this subject

will at once see the justice, namely, that a very large portion of those works consists of statements which, while forming part of his argument *beg the whole question*, their applicability and force depending wholly upon the meaning of certain *terms* used in them, *the proper interpretation of which forms one of the great points at issue*. For instance, the words "The Holy Eucharist," "the sacrament," "the Lord's body," are all used by Dr Pusey as necessarily bearing the sense he attaches to them, and passages in which they occur in other authors are quoted as testimonies in his favour, when in fact the proper meaning to be attached to these phrases is the chief point in dispute. After consecration, the bread may be very properly called "The Lord's body," as being so representatively and symbolically, by those who are wholly opposed to the notion of the real body of our Lord being present in or under it. Dr Pusey may intend to be very honest in the matter, but the effect of his following such a course is, that whatever success he obtains with his readers in such a way, is obtained, not by valid arguments, but by deluding and mystifying them.'

122. 'Dr Pusey devotes his preface to a notice of my answer to his argument from the Fathers, especially that part of it which is grounded on the fact, that the Fathers themselves tell us, that it is customary to call the *signs* in the Eucharist by *the names of the things signified*, and gives reasons why the *bread* is called *Christ's body*, and the *wine* His *blood*. But his reply fails altogether in meeting the argument. The force of the argument lies in this, that the *bread itself* is called Christ's body and the *wine itself* His blood. But Dr Pusey answers the argument as if it were this, that the *sacrament* is called Christ's body, and then (giving his own interpretation to the word *sacrament*), runs off to show that a thing *compounded of two parts* may be called by the name of one of them, and that the Fathers "called the whole [sacrament] by the name of the inward part, which makes it what it is" (p. xvii.), which is altogether wide of the mark, and totally misses the force of the argument to which it professes to be a reply. All the pages therefore he has spent on this point are altogether thrown away. And my statement, that "The fact that the signs are called by the names of the things signified sweeps away at once the larger portion of Dr Pusey's testimonies, to which Dr Pusey takes exception" (p. xxvii.), remains untouched.'

123. 'And so again, in order to get rid of objections, a terminology is adopted which may enable Dr Pusey to hold his doctrine, and at the same time deliver him from the necessity of meeting the difficulties attaching to it. Thus he says, "In the Holy Eucharist, the body and blood of Christ do not (as Mr Goode often represents us as teaching), form one whole [*i.e.*, with the bread and wine] *except sacramentally*. There is no physical union of the body and blood of Christ with the bread and wine" (p. xvii.) But what is the meaning of the words "*except sacramentally?*" Dr Pusey holds that the two are so united that they necessarily go together into the mouth of the communicant. Whether Dr Pusey chooses to call this union sacramental, or wonderful, or transcendental, or incomprehensible, or anything else, is a matter of indifference. The fact of such a union is the question in dispute. And to give it an ambiguous or incomprehensible epithet, in order to make it unassailable, is useless, except to mislead the reader. And when he adds, "Where the consecrated bread is, there, sacramentally, is the body of Christ; where the consecrated wine is, there, sacramentally, is the blood of Christ," I reply, Of course; but what is the meaning of the word "sacramentally?"'

124. 'In an argumentative point of view a work so written is wholly useless. It may mislead an incompetent or unwary reader, and form a convenient book of reference for a partizan; but in the way of argument and proof to one desirous of arriving at the truth, it is absolutely valueless. And hence, on the same ground, Dr Pusey's work on the Testimony of the Fathers, to which he refers with such apparently large expectations of the effects it is likely to produce, is noticed by the present Bishop of St David's only as being one of those "compilations which are bringing the name of *Catena* into suspicion and disrepute, as equivalent to *an organ of polemical delusion*."'—(Charge for 1857, p. 26.)

125. 'It is really difficult to understand how such a man as Dr Pusey can be unconscious of the delusion he is practising on the unwary reader, in thus misleading him as to the point at issue; but the tone of deep feeling and almost child-like simplicity which characterises the language he uses on the subject, makes one unwilling to believe that he is conscious of it. But it must not be forgotten that such a style has been often adopted by the advocates of all the errors and extravagances of the Church of Rome.'—*The Nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist, &c. Supplement*, pp. 16-20.

126. You should bear in mind that these pointed, but just and wholesome strictures upon the very questionable manner in which you treated the sacramental language of the Fathers only related to a few pages which appear as a preface to a volume which you published about two years after the one containing your 400 pages of extracts from the Fathers. It does not appear that Dean Goode ever investigated the manner in which

you performed the task of collating your patristic testimony, and probably he had no knowledge of its containing such damaging blemishes as those pointed out in this letter to you. Nay, you lay your hands upon him and claim him as a witness to the conscientious manner in which you have performed your task. You say,

127. 'I have in my work, "The Doctrine 'of the Real Presence, as contained in the 'Fathers, from the death of St John the 'Evangelist to the fourth General Council," 'A.D. 451, set down, to the utmost of my 'knowledge, every passage bearing upon the 'doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, from which 'any argument could be drawn. I have set 'these down, I may say, with such conscien-'tiousness, that Mr Goode thinks that I 'have brought forward passages, which tell 'against my belief, as well as those which 'attest it.'—(35, 53.)

128. I should esteem it as a great favour if you would inform me where, in the writings of Dean Goode, he has said 'he thinks that 'you have brought forward passages from 'the Fathers which attest your belief.' He does not admit, any more than Bishop Jewel did, that a single early Father held your doctrine. And as to your saying, 'he *thinks* 'that you have brought forward passages 'which tell against your belief,' that is worse than idle talk, for as you have already seen in the above extracts from his reply to you, he sweeps away seven-tenths of your extracts from the Fathers, by allowing them to interpret their own sacramental language, and not allowing you to misinterpret it by the Paschasian canon.

129. I must now leave Augustine, and what has naturally arisen out of the sacramental teaching of the most distinguished human authority in the early Church, and point out to you some more famous passages, which you have either deliberately suppressed, or have unknowingly omitted, which are of fundamental importance to a correct interpretation and a right understanding of the Eucharistic teaching of the Fathers.

130. I call your attention to two very striking passages, in which the consecrated elements are so spoken of as to show that the men who could so speak were wholly unacquainted with your doctrine. One of these you have omitted, and the other you have quoted after a manner that requires no describing. Chrysostom writes, 'Again the 'Scripture is accustomed to call both the 'mysteries [consecrated bread and wine of 'the Lord's Supper] and the whole Church 'by the name of flesh, saying that they are 'the body of Christ.'—(22, 27.)

131. Theodoret writes, 'Christ honoured 'the visible symbols with the title of body 'and blood.' But you make him write, 'He honoured the symbols which are seen 'with the title of *bread* and *wine*.'—(23, 40.)

132. Is it credible that if these distinguished Fathers believed with you and Dr Wiseman that when Christ said, 'This is my body,' He intended it to be understood as literally as 'The Word was God,' they could have thus spoken? You affirm truly, 'Since 'His body is there, there must His soul be 'also, there also His Divinity.'—(35, 68.) Doubtless both Chrysostom and Theodoret admitted a truth so obvious. Had Chrysostom believed the consecrated bread and wine to be whole Christ, God and Man, you may be quite sure he would not have spoken thus. Least of all, if Theodoret had entertained your belief, could he have said that Christ honoured the symbols—the consecrated symbols,—that is, His body, soul, and divinity, —with the title of body and blood. What conception you can have of the symbols of which Theodoret speaks, it is difficult to conceive. For to designate them bread and wine is no honour to them, for such they were before consecration, and after consecration they were still bread and wine, yet honoured with the title of body and blood, for, according to Augustine, as has been shown, 'Scripture is wont to speak, calling 'the things signifying as if they were the 'things signified,' and that 'Sacraments 'receive, for the most part, the names even 'of the things themselves.'—(Sections 83, 84, 86, 87.)

133. I will now call your attention to some other passages of the Fathers of a more general character, but of fundamental importance to a right understanding of their figurative language, and which have no place in your quotations from the Fathers.

134. Origen writes, 'There is therefore a 'meat and drink of this material man, which 'is also called the outer man, suitable to its 'nature, to wit, that which is corporeal and 'earthly. And in like manner also there is 'an appropriate meat of that spiritual man 'which is called the inner man, as that living 'bread which came down from heaven. But 'there is also that drink of that water which 'Jesus promised, saying, "Whosoever drink-'eth of the water that I shall give him shall 'never thirst." Thus, therefore, in all things 'there is used a similarity of phrases as it 'respects both the inward and the outward 'man; but the property of the things is pre-'served unmixed to each, and to that which 'is corruptible corruptible things are given, 'and to that which is incorruptible incor-'ruptible things are offered.'—(11, 43.)

135. This canon of interpretation is of general application to the whole of the Scriptures, and quite precludes any literal reception of Christ's body and blood into the corporeal corruptible bodies of men. Origen does not say, nor can his words be so understood, 'Save and except when in the Lord's 'Supper, the communicant, whether saint 'or sinner, receives by his mouth into his

'natural body the real body and blood of Christ.' Such an exception would be gross violation of the canon.

136. Origen freely admits that Christ is often called what physically He is not, for he says, 'Therefore He is also called the true 'Light, that the eyes of the soul may have 'that by which they may be enlightened: 'Therefore also He is called the Word, that 'the ears may have that which they may 'hear: Therefore also He is called the Bread 'of life, that the taste of the soul may have 'what it may taste.'—(11, 44.)

137. If your 400 pages of extracts from the Fathers had been augmented by four pages of passages from the writings of the Fathers such as the above, there would have been a wholesome and necessary caution against interpreting the highly figurative language of the Fathers literally.

138. I have a still more important omission to notice. When the communicants were receiving the consecrated elements, a portion of the 34th Psalm was repeated. This we learn from the most ancient Greek Liturgies, such as the Clementine, the one which goes under the name of St James, and the Liturgy used by Cyril of Jerusalem. An allusion to this last will be quite sufficient to illustrate the others. Cyril, in his lecture to the newly-initiated communicants, addresses them thus: 'After this ye hear the chanter, 'with a sacred melody inviting you to the 'communion of the holy mysteries, and saying, "O taste and see that the Lord is 'good." (Ps. xxxiv. 8.) Trust not the decision to thy bodily palate; no, but to 'faith unfaltering; for when we taste we 'are bidden to taste not bread and wine, but 'the *sign* of the body and blood of Christ.' —(15, 15.) Here we see how the sign, that is, the sacraments or mysteries, of the body and blood of Christ were received. But how were the body and blood received? by the natural mouth or otherwise? I think you must admit that Basil, a contemporary bishop with Cyril, gives a very plain answer in his exposition of the very words used at the distribution of the consecrated elements, viz., 'O taste and see that the Lord is good.' On those very words he remarks, 'We have 'observed in many places that the faculties 'of the soul are called by the same names 'as the external members of the body, and 'since our Lord is the true bread, and His 'flesh the true meat, it is necessary that the 'pleasure and joy derived from that bread 'should accrue to us through a mental taste' —(16, 2.)

139. It appears most unaccountable that this well-known passage should have been omitted. Bishop Jewel has at least quoted it five times against your doctrine. Your not knowing of this and other like passages, and Bishop Jewel knowing of them and well understanding them, may account for the opposite conclusions to which you and he have come, as to whether or not the Fathers believed and taught the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements.

140. You profess to have found that the Fathers of the first *four* centuries believed that the body and blood of Christ were really present in the consecrated elements (section 29). Whilst Bishop Jewel, even with the help of a very able learned Roman Catholic priest, could not find that the Fathers of the first *six* centuries held that doctrine, but without his help adduced a great mass of evidence, which has ever been accepted by the learned men of the Church to which you and I belong, as conclusive proof that they did not hold that doctrine.

141. Accepting the account which you have given of the manner in which you have made your quotations, I must presume that the real character of them is unknown to you. The quotations which I have to notice I shall take for the most part in the order in which they stand in their respective authors.

142. I begin with your quotations from Irenæus, in which transposition, mistranslation, and omissions have quite changed the character of his teaching, so much so, that he appears to be a witness in favour of your doctrine, whereas his teaching, when correctly given, is against it. This will appear by giving in their proper order two quotations which you have transposed, and by giving 'so much of the context as is necessary 'for the clear exhibition of the meaning of 'the parts' which you have quoted, and a more accurate translation of a very important passage. To distinguish what you have quoted from what you have not quoted, I shall give the former in italics.

143. (1.) '*But counselling also His disciples, to offer to God first-fruits from His creatures, not as though He needed ought, but that they might not be unfruitful nor ungrateful, He took that which of His creation is bread, and gave thanks, saying, "This is my body." And likewise the cup, which is of that our creation, He confessed to be His blood, and taught that it is the New Oblation of the New Testament;* (2) which (*quam*) the Church receiving from the apostles, offers to God, throughout all the world, to Him who gives us as the means of subsistence, the first-fruits of His own gifts in the New Testament; (3) *of which* (quo) *among the twelve Prophets, Malachi thus presignified;* "*I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of Hosts, neither,*" &c. (Mal. i. 10, 11). *Most clearly signifying by these words that the former people, indeed, shall cease to offer to God; but in every place sacrifice shall be offered to Him, and that pure; and His name shall be glorified among the heathen.*' . . . '(4) Since, therefore, the name of the Son 'belongs to the Father, and since in the

'omnipotent God the Church makes offerings 'through Jesus Christ (per Jesum Christum). 'He says well on both these grounds, "And 'in every place incense is offered to my name, 'and a pure sacrifice." Now John, in the 'the Apocalypse, declares that the "incense" 'is "the prayers of the saints." The obla- 'tion of the Church, therefore, which the 'Lord gave instructions to be offered through- 'out all the world, is accounted with God a 'pure sacrifice, and is acceptable to Him; 'not that He stands in need of a sacrifice 'from us, but that he who offers is himself 'glorified in what he does offer, if his gift 'be accepted. . . . Inasmuch, then, as the 'Church offers with single-mindedness, her 'gift is justly reckoned a pure sacrifice with 'God. As Paul also says to the Philippians, '"I am full, having received from Epa- 'phroditus the things that were sent from 'you, the odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice 'acceptable, pleasing to God." For it be- 'hoves us to make an oblation to God, and 'in all things to be found grateful to God 'our Maker, in a pure mind, and in faith 'without hypocrisy, in well-grounded hope, 'in fervent love, offering the first fruits of 'His own created things; and (5) *this obla- 'tion the Church alone offers pure to the 'Creator, offering it to Him with thanksgiving 'from His creation'* [or rather, offering to 'Him with giving of thanks the things taken 'from His creation], '*But the Jews do not 'offer: for their hands are full of blood: for 'they have not received* THE WORD WHICH IS 'OFFERED TO GOD,' [or rather, 'Through 'which it is offered to God *per quod offertur 'Deo*]. . . . (6) So did the Word give to the 'people that very precept as to the making 'of oblations, although He stood in no need 'of them, that they might learn to serve 'God: thus is it, therefore, also His will 'that we, too, should offer a gift at the altar, 'frequently and without intermission. The 'altar, then, is in heaven (for towards that 'place are our prayers and oblations directed); 'the temple likewise is there, as John says 'in the Apocalypse, "And the temple of 'God was opened;" the tabernacle also, '"For behold," he says, "the tabernacle of 'God, in which He will dwell with men"' (**8**, 1-5).

144. I cannot do better than contrast what you make Irenæus appear to teach with what he really does teach. You give two independent quotations from Irenæus which are re-quoted above, and numbered 1, 3, and 5, and are distinguished by italics. But you place number 5 before numbers 1 and 3, and as translated by you would seem to convey the idea that the oblation which the Church offers to God is the Word. Whereas what Irenæus really teaches is, that things taken from God's creation are offered to Him through the Word. Then the part numbered 1 and 3, which you place after number 5, you garble by leaving out a sentence in the middle, numbered 2, and by using a capital letter to the word oblation, it will not be wanting on your part if your readers do not understand the word oblation in the sense in which you appear to have misinterpreted it in part in number 5, for if there the oblation is the Word of God, the word oblation which by transposition you place after, and distinguish by a capital letter, might be easily understood, or rather misunderstood after the same manner. But in this, as in the other case, the offering is not the Lord Jesus, but gifts by the laity towards a social feast, out of which might be taken the elements for the Lord's Supper. This is the very most which could be made of the passage. Now if you had given this passage from Irenæus as you say, you 'have given every passage 'with so much of the context as was neces- 'sary for the clear exhibition of its meaning,' if you had not transposed your quotations, and had not garbled a part, and mistranslated other parts, your readers would have seen that the oblation spoken of consists of gifts and services rendered to God, and which are all of a spiritual nature, and are such as can only be offered at an altar in heaven. A little before Irenæus had said 'The Church 'makes offerings through Jesus Christ.' Doubtless Irenæus teaches not that the Word, that is Jesus Christ, was offered to God, but that the faithful presented all their spiritual offerings to God through the Word, that is Christ.

145. But by representing Irenæus as teaching that the Word is offered to God, you appear to make him a heretic. The Word is inclusive of Christ's Godhead, and cannot be exclusive of it. But in the original sacrifice once offered the Godhead was not offered. Theodoret says, 'The Lord Himself promised 'to give, not His invisible nature, but His 'body, for the life of the world. For He 'saith, "The bread which I will give is my 'flesh, which I will give for the life of the 'world." And, when delivering the divine 'mysteries, He took the symbol and said, '"This is my body which is given," or '"broken" according to the apostle, "for 'you." And nowhere, in discoursing of His 'passion, did He mention the Impassible 'Godhead' (**23**, 50).

146. The next in order is a passage from Clement of Alexandria, an important part of which is wrongly translated, and as 'so much 'of the context as was necessary for the clear 'exhibition of its meaning' is suppressed, your quotation will be distinguished from its context by being given in italics.

147. Clement appears to be giving an allegorical interpretation of Galatians i. 1-5, and some analogous passages. Quoting the words 'I have fed you with milk (as children in 'Christ), not with meat' (1 Cor. iii. 2), . . . he 'remarks,' and after a slight stop, let us

add,' "as children," that by separating the 'words in reading we may make out some 'such sense as this: I have instructed you 'in Christ with simple, true, and natural 'nourishment, namely, that which is spiritual, 'for such is the nourishing substance of milk 'swelling out from breasts of love. So that 'the whole matter may be conceived thus: 'As nurses nourish new-born children on 'milk, so do I also by the word, the milk of 'Christ, instilling into you spiritual nutri-'ment. . . . The word being figuratively 'represented as milk. "For my blood," says 'the Lord, "is true drink." In saying, 'therefore, "I have given you milk to drink," 'has He not indicated the knowledge of the 'truth, the perfect gladness in the word, which 'is the milk? For the very same word is fluid 'and mild as milk, or solid and compact as 'meat. And entertaining this view, we may 'regard the proclamation of the gospel, which 'is universally diffused, as milk and as meat. '. . . Elsewhere the Lord, in the gospel ac-'cording to John, brought this out by sym-'bols, when He said, "Eat ye my flesh, and 'drink my blood," describing distinctly by 'metaphor the drinkable properties of faith 'and the promise, by means of which the 'Church, like a human being consisting of 'many members. . . . The blood of the 'word has been also exhibited as milk. . . . '*One is the Father of all; One also is the 'Word of all; and the Holy Spirit, One and 'the same everywhere. And one only virgin 'mother is formed, I would call her, Church. 'This mother alone had not milk, because she 'alone never became a woman; but she is at 'once a virgin and a mother; undefiled, as a 'virgin; full of love as a mother; and calling 'her children to her, she nurses them with holy 'milk, the Infant Word. Therefore she had 'not milk; because this her own beautiful child 'was milk, the Body of Christ nourishing for 'the Word that new progeny, with whom the 'Lord Himself travailed with bodily pang, 'whom the Lord Himself swaddled with Pre-'cious Blood. O holy birth! O holy swaddling 'bands! The Word is all to the infant, Father 'and Mother, Instructor and Nourisher. "Eat 'ye," He saith, "my flesh and drink my blood." 'This food from Himself the Lord provideth 'for us, and offereth flesh, and poureth out 'blood, and nothing is wanting to the children's 'growth. O marvellous mystery! He bids us 'put off from us the old corruption of the flesh, 'as also the old food, and partaking of another 'new nourishment, that of Christ, receiving 'Him as far as possible,* to lay Him up in 'ourselves and place the Saviour in our breast, 'that we may correct the passions of our flesh.'

'But you are not inclined to under-'stand it thus, but perchance more gener-'ally.' He then gives another interpreta-tion, in which he states as follows: 'Thus 'in many ways the word is figuratively 'described, as meat, and flesh, and food, 'and bread, and blood, and milk. The 'Lord is all these, to give enjoyment to 'us who have believed on Him. Let no one 'then think it strange when we say that the 'Lord's blood is figuratively represented as 'milk. For is it not figuratively represented 'as wine? In all respects, therefore, and in 'all things, we are brought into union with 'Christ, into relationship through His blood, 'by which we are redeemed; and into sym-'pathy, in consequence of the nourishment 'which flows from the Word; and into im-'mortality, through His guidance. . . . The 'same blood and milk of the Lord is there-'fore the symbol of the Lord's passion and 'teaching' (**9**, 1-5).

148. It is to be inferred that you have quoted this passage to prove that Christ is really received in the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper. Your note explaining two Greek words confirms this view of the case. The same passage, with a similar note, is used by Roman Catholics for the same purpose.

149. You should know that the phrase '*The Word*' is used by such Fathers as Clement, Origen, and Augustine, not only as a title of the Lord Jesus Christ, but also as a designation of Holy Scripture, and they apply the phrase to both as if there were no distinction between them. Clement is giving an allegorical interpretation of the words, 'I 'have fed you with milk, not with meat.' Doubtless St Paul by the words 'milk' and 'meat' is referring to the Holy Scriptures, or to that which by him was afterwards re-corded as Holy Scripture, and not necessarily to the second Person in the Holy Trinity, and in that sense does Clement use the phrase 'the word' in the above passage from his writings, not excepting the part quoted by you as given in italics above. It is true, at the beginning of your quotation, Clement personifies the written Word or the Scrip-tures as the second person in the Trinity, because he and other Fathers made no marked distinction between 'the word' as a title of the Lord and as a designation of Holy Scrip-ture. And of that 'word,' as thus understood by him, he says, 'Thus in many ways the word 'is figuratively described as meat, and flesh, 'and food, and bread, and blood, and milk. 'The Lord is all these, to give enjoyment to 'us who have believed in Him. Let no one 'then think it strange when we say that the 'Lord's blood is figuratively represented as 'milk. For is it not figuratively represented 'as wine?' What Clement here says of 'the 'word' is more applicable to it as a designa-tion of the Scriptures than as a title of Christ as God. Clement, three times in the above portion of his writings, speaks of children as

* '*I have rendered the Greek, "as far as possible;" the meaning being, apparently, that we receive Christ in our-selves, who, as God, filleth heaven and earth, and there-fore cannot be received wholly.*'

nourished by or with the word. Thus he says, 'As nurses nourish new-born children 'on milk, so do I [Paul] also *by the word*, 'the milk of Christ.' 'For the milk was 'this child fair and comely, the body of 'Christ, which nourishes *by the word* the 'progeny.' 'The nourishment which flows 'from the word.' I come now to the gravest part of your misrepresentation of the teaching of Clement. By your translation you represent Clement not as teaching that 'the word' is that *by* or *with* which children are nourished, but as that *for* which they are nourished. When it is borne in mind that Clement is giving an allegorical interpretation of the words 'I have fed you with milk,' it is natural to infer that in speaking of children as nourished by the word, he is rather referring to the word of Scripture than to the Word as a title of the Son of God. Your translation is, 'The Body of Christ nourish-'ing *for* the Word that new progeny.' That the translation should be *by* or *with* the word is shown by the whole of the context, but especially by the two phrases in which the same form of Greek expression occurs. 'So 'do I also nourish *by* the word the milk of 'Christ.' 'Nourishment which flows *from* 'the word.' Doubtless Clement here designates by 'the word' the Scriptures, for it would be incongruous to speak of nourishing any one *for* the Scriptures. The meaning which you attach to the phrase 'the Body of 'Christ' perhaps may be inferred from your translation of the words which immediately follow, viz., 'nourishing *for* the Word.' It would seem that you understand the real body of Christ which was crucified and which when duly received in the consecrated elements you would regard as nourishing for the Word. But it is quite certain that Clement does not say *for* the Word, but *by* or *with* the word. Notice what sense the words would render with that certain and necessary correction. 'The body of Christ' (really and objectively present in the consecrated elements) 'nourishing with the word,' &c. You see that wont do. 'The body of Christ, 'which was born of Mary,' cannot be understood. It remains then that Christ's body, the Church, is to be understood. That body nourishing *by* or *with* the word, that is, the Holy Scriptures, the new progeny. A candid examination of your quotation, 'with so 'much of the context as is necessary for the 'clear exhibition of its meaning,' will make you perfectly certain that that is really what Clement teaches.

150. As the Roman Catholics have quoted the same passage from Clement for the very same purpose which you have done, it may be interesting to you to compare your translation of a portion of the passage with their translation of the same passage, and both with the translation as given in the 'Ante-Nicene Christian Library.' 'Because this 'her own beautiful child was milk, the Body 'of Christ nourishing *for* the Word that 'new progeny.'

151. 'Because this beautiful and her own 'child was milk, feeding the new people '*with* the Word.'

152. 'For the milk was this child fair and 'comely, the body of Christ, which nourishes '*by* the Word the young brood.'

153. Your translation, which is the first, differs from the other two, you having *for* the Word, they having *with* or *by* the Word. I believe their translations in that particular are right, and yours wrong. The Roman Catholic translation also differs from both the others, for, strange as it may appear, the phrase, 'the body of Christ,' is suppressed. Your translation and that of a Romanist differing from what I believe is the correct translation, perhaps may arise from the fact that both of you were not so much actuated by a desire to represent the exact teaching of Clement, as to make it appear that he taught your respective doctrines of the real presence. The difference between you and the Romanist probably arises from a difference of opinion as to the better mode of attaining your respective objects. The Romanist deletes the phrase, 'the body of Christ,' probably because such words as 'the body of Christ feeding the 'new people with the Word,' when considered in the light of the context, might suggest the true teaching of Clement—viz., Christ's body, the Church feeding the new people with the Word—that is, the Holy Scriptures. On the contrary, you have retained the words, 'the body of Christ,' but in using the little word *for*, in the place of *by* or *with*, you have in effect done the same thing as the Romanist—viz., quite misrepresented the teaching of Clement. I do not know what stress you would lay upon the words, 'Eat my flesh and drink my blood,' which occur in your quotation, but the Romanist gives them in italics. That Clement understands that language figuratively is quite certain, for in the very interpretation of which those words form a part, he says, as may be seen above, 'The Lord, in 'the Gospel according to John, brought out 'this by symbols, when He said, "Eat ye 'my flesh, and drink my blood."'

154. It is true Clement uses the phrase, 'O marvellous mystery,' which by ill-instructed Ritualists is claimed as proof that he was a believer of the comparatively modern doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements, and which by some Protestants, no better informed, is conceded as proof of the same thing. Doubtless to eat the real flesh or body of Christ in the sacramental bread, and to drink His real blood in the sacramental wine, would indeed be a profound mystery, in our sense of the term.

You call it 'the most marvellous of miracles' (35, 67). But it is quite certain that Clement is not here referring to a mystery or miracle of that kind. For the eating of Christ's flesh and drinking of His blood in the sixth of St John, he interprets figuratively, which has been just noticed, and is more fully shown in the context of the passage which you quoted from his writings, as given above. And neither in that passage nor in its context does he make any allusion to a sacramental participation of Christ's body and blood. Most certainly Clement does not utter his exclamation, 'O marvel-'lous mystery!' concerning bread and wine becoming really and truly Christ's body and blood, without ceasing to be what they really are, which was once your doctrine (35, 32, 36), nor concerning bread and wine being changed into Christ's real body and blood, and retaining only the appearance of their former substance, which is the Roman Catholic doctrine, and now appears to be yours (35, 70, xii. 52, xiii. 74); but concerning that marvellous union between Christ and true believers. St Paul, alluding to the same thing, exclaims, 'This is a great mys-'tery.' The great mystery or secret is the marvellous union of the Church, or body of true believers with Christ, and so Augustine understood it (21, 116). And this is exactly how Chrysostom and the Fathers generally understood the word mystery, not as an inscrutable mystery, but as a revealed secret to the initiated, yet so sublime as to attract the wonder of angels. Chrysostom plainly states, 'It is necessary for us to understand 'the marvel of the mysteries' (22, 13), and goes on to explain it as being our mystical union and incorporation with Christ. Clement and other Fathers, believing and realising the union of believers with Christ, out of the fulness of their hearts expressed, as was natural, that most wonderful union in an impressive manner, and alluded to it in terms of very high admiration.

155. If you will examine your own quotation from Clement, according to your own rule, 'with so much of the context as is 'necessary for the clear exhibition of its 'meaning,' you will be quite assured that he is not at all referring to a *marvellous mystery* in the sense you understand it, but to a totally different thing.

156. The most distinct allusion which Clement makes to a participation of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements does not appear to have come within the extent of your knowledge, for it forms no part of your extracts. Clement says, 'Wherefore 'the Saviour, taking the bread, first spake 'and blessed. Then breaking the bread, He 'presented it, that we might eat according 'to reason, and that, knowing the Script-'tures, we might walk obediently (9, 9).

157. The next Father in order is Tertullian, a passage from whose writings you have so quoted as to shake one's confidence in the trustworthiness of your quotations. I shall first give the passage as quoted by you, and then give it with the explanatory clause which you have suppressed.

158. "'He shall wash," saith he, "His 'garments in wine, and His clothes in the 'blood of grapes." So now, too, He *hath 'consecrated His blood in wine*, Who then 'figured forth wine in blood' (10, 14).

159. '"He shall wash," saith He, 'His 'garments in wine, and His clothes in the 'blood of grapes"—showing the garments 'and clothes to be His flesh, and the wine 'to be His blood. So now, too, He hath 'consecrated His blood in wine, who then 'figured wine in blood (sanguinem suum in 'vino consecravit, qui tunc vinum in san-'guine figuravit').

160. By suppressing the explanatory clause and distinguishing a part of your quotation by italics, you mislead your readers. This part of Tertullian's writings, when fairly given, so far from supporting your doctrine, is really subversive of it. You teach that by consecration wine becomes blood, but if Tertullian's language is to be understood literally, as you seem to assume, he teaches that Christ's blood becomes wine. Had Tertullian happened to have said, 'Showing his 'flesh to be garments and clothes, and His 'blood to be wine, so now, too, He hath 'consecrated wine in His blood, who then 'figured blood in wine.' This, so far as the mere sound of words is concerned, would have appeared to be in your favour, but the sound of the words is against you. For, according to Tertullian, here and elsewhere, the change, whatever it is, is not of wine into blood, which you require, but of blood into wine, which you do not require. But why leave out that explanatory clause, and make your quotation as if no omission had been made?

161. Tertullian and the Fathers generally understood the words, 'This bread is my 'body,' as the same in meaning as the words, 'My body is this bread.' In your list of extracts from the Fathers, by gross mistranslations and omissions, you have nearly concealed from your readers this important part of the teaching of the Fathers, which is really fatal to your doctrine, and this may account for the manner in which you have treated this portion of patristic testimony.

162. I shall notice your mis-translations, first beginning with Tertullian. In one quotation in relation to this point you have translated Tertullian fairly. I will give the passage, which will be a guide for parallel passages.

163. 'It belonged to the vanity of Mar-'cion, that bread should be crucified. But 'why doth *He call His body bread*, and not 'rather a pompion, which Marcion had in-

'stead of a heart? not understanding that 'that was an ancient figure of the Body of 'Christ, saying through Jeremiah, "They 'have devised devices against me, saying, 'Let us cast wood to His bread"—that is, 'the cross on His Body. Therefore the En-'lightener of the things of old hath plainly 'shown what He meant bread to signify, '*calling His Body bread*' (10, 13).

164. If the above translation is right in the two instances concerning the present point, as I believe it is, then in the following instance you have given a wrong translation: 'For so Christ revealed, *calling bread* '*His body*, of whose Body afore the prophet 'spake figuratively, as bread' (10, 1).

165. The passage given, 'with so much of 'the context as is necessary for the clear 'exhibition of its meaning,' and more accurately translated, is as follows: '"Come let 'us put wood on his bread," &c. (Jer. xi. '19). Therefore wood is put upon his body. For so Christ revealed *calling His body bread*, 'of whose body afore the prophet figured in 'bread' (panem corpus suum, cujus retro corpus in panc prophetes figuravit).

166. Before making any remarks, I will give another of your quotations relating to the present point, and treat it after the same manner as the former one.

167. For so God revealed in 'your Gospel 'too, *calling bread His body*, that hence, too, 'thou mayest at once understand that He 'gave the bread to be a figure of His body, 'of which body the prophet aforetime spake 'figuratively as bread' (10, 10).

168. '"Come let us put wood upon His 'bread'—that is, on His body. For so God 'revealed in your Gospel (that of St Luke) 'too, *calling His body bread*, that hence, too, 'thou mayest at once understand that He 'gave the figure of His body to bread, whose 'body the prophet aforetime figured into 'bread' (corporis sui figuram pane dedisse cujus retro corpus in panem prophetes figuravit).

169. If you will compare section 164, which is your translation, with section 165, where 'so much of the context is given as is neces-'sary for the clear exhibition of the meaning 'of the passage;' and also compare section 167, containing your extract, with section 168, which is given after the same manner as the preceding one, you cannot be otherwise than certain that Tertullian represents the Lord Jesus Christ as calling His own body bread, and by several analogous phrases plainly shows that he conceives of a change, whatever the change is, of body into bread, and of blood into wine, which proves most certainly that he is a witness not for your doctrine, but against it; and if you had not concealed his testimony by misrepresenting it, your readers would have seen that it is against you. Note well his phraseology. 'Consecrated His blood in wine.' Section 159, 'Bread should be crucified; but why 'doth He call His body bread? Under-'standing that bread was an ancient figure 'of the body of Christ. What He meant 'bread to signify, calling His body bread.' Section 163. 'Christ revealed, calling His 'body bread, of whose body afore the pro-'phet figured in bread.' Section 165. "God 'revealed in your Gospel of St Luke also, 'calling His body bread . . . whose body 'the Prophet aforetime figured into bread.' Section 168.

170. If Tertullian had believed your doctrine, is it possible that a man of such a vigorous intellect and such zeal for his Lord and Master could say that He called His body bread, and could have used such language as the above? Such a style of teaching is subversive of the notion that bread by consecration so becomes the body of Christ, that whoever receives that bread receives whole Christ, God and man. Tertullian regarding the words, 'This is my body,' as a figurative phrase, as in fact he plainly teaches. It is of little consequence whether he says that Christ called His body bread, or bread His body. That he did think it of little consequence, is certain from the fact that he uses, as do other Fathers, the phrases Christ 'called His body bread,' He called bread 'His body,' interchangeably.

171. The Fathers commonly, and perhaps correctly, understood our Lord's words, This is my body,' much in the same sense as if He had said, 'My body is this bread.' Their sentiments appear on this point in their comments on the words as they stood in the version of the Scriptures which they used. 'Come, let us put wood on 'His 'bread' (Jer. xi. 19). Rabanus Maurus has truly said in his commentary on the passage, 'This is the *consensus* of all the Churches 'that under the person of Jeremiah they 'understood that these things were said by 'Christ . . . and they said, "Let us put 'wood upon His bread"—that is, the cross 'on the Saviour's body" (26, 6).

172. Theodoret, in his commentary on the words, says, 'The word of prophecy chiefly 'agrees with the Lord Christ. For He 'called the (τὸ) body of Himself bread' (23, 20).

173. Before pointing out some important passages which you have omitted in relation to this point, and some unaccountable mistranslations concerning the same thing, it will be suitable to have before us your own dogmatic teaching respecting it. You say, 'One can then hardly understand how, from 'mouth to mouth, the sophism could be 'repeated, that, because our Lord could 'speak of Himself under a metaphor, "I 'am the true vine," &c., therefore, when He 'speaks not of Himself, but says, "this 'thing," and then declares what that thing of 'which He is speaking, is in words absolutely

'excluding metaphor, "My body which is 'given for you," "My blood of the New Testa-'ment, which is shed for many for the re-'mission of sins;" the predicate is here, too, 'to be a figure, unfigurative as the words 'are. In the phrase, I am the vine, &c., 'truth is declared under symbolic or meta-'phoric language. In our blessed Lord's 'words of institution, "this is my body," 'there is no mention of any symbol. He 'does not say, "this bread is my body," 'but "this thing," which I give you is my 'body"' (**35**, 70).

174. But this your teaching is neither primitive nor catholic, as I will now show on the evidence adduced by Dr Pusey of 1855. He says, 'Yet the Fathers say this '["This *bread* is my body"], or what is 'equivalent to it. To give instances which 'have been brought together,' and here follows a long list (p. 258, x. 49-53). The very same Dr Pusey, but of an earlier date (1853), says 'S. Basil, S. Gregory of Nazi-'anzum, S. Macarius, Eusebius, Theodoret, 'Eustathius, S. Augustine, say, as did Ter-'tullian, that the consecrated elements are 'symbols, types, antitypes, figures, images 'of our Lord's Body and Blood' (**35**, 20; xii. 12, 13). In 1853 you believed, in accordance with the unanimous consent of the Fathers, and contrary to the Roman Catholic Church, that the consecrated elements were symbols, signs, &c., and with the same consent and against the same Church, you believed that Christ called bread His body; but in 1871, against the consent of all antiquity, and in accordance with the Roman Church, you appear to deny that the consecrated elements are symbols, and that Christ said, or meant to be understood to say, that bread was His body.

175. Dr Wiseman, whom you very much follow, especially in his novelties, says, 'Christ does not say, "Bread is my body," '"Wine is my blood," which in point of 'construction would have brought these 'words within a possibility of a comparison 'with the "seven kine are seven years," or, '"the horns are kings" (**34**, 19). The Fathers, beyond all question, do teach that Christ affirmed of bread that it was His body. Then, according to Dr Wiseman, for whose opinions you have so much regard, the phrase, 'This is my body,' is a figurative form of speech.

176. I come now to notice some of your omissions which conceal from the reader the sense in which the Fathers understood the phrase, 'This is my body;' for if certain passages had been quoted by you, your readers would have had conclusive proofs that the Fathers did not understand that proposition literally, but figuratively.

177. The first omission to which I shall call your attention immediately precedes a quotation which you have incorrectly made from Cyprian. I shall first give it, and then give it as corrected, and with your omission supplied.

178. 'Nor can His blood, whereby we 'have been redeemed and quickened, appear 'to be in the Cup, when the Cup is without 'that wine, whereby the Blood of Christ is 'set forth, as is declared by the mystical 'meaning and testimony of all the Scrip-'tures' (**12**, 3).

179. "Know then that I have been ad-'monished that, in offering the cup, the 'tradition of the Lord must be observed, 'and that nothing must be done by us but 'what the Lord first did on our behalf, as 'that the cup which is offered in remem-'brance of Him should be offered mingled 'with wine. For when Christ says, "I am 'the true vine," *the blood of Christ is* '*assuredly* not water, but *wine;* neither can 'His blood, by which we are redeemed and 'quickened, appear to be in the cup, when 'in the cup there is no wine whereby the 'blood of Christ is shown (*ostenditur*), which 'is declared by the sacrament and testimony 'of all the Scriptures *was shed* (*effusus*) **12**. 2, 3).

180. The following, from Cyprian, forms no part of your patristic testimony: 'For 'when *the Lord calls His body bread*, which 'is made up of the union of many grains, He 'indicates our people whom He bore united 'together; and when *He calls His blood* '*wine*, which is pressed from many bunches 'and clusters, and drawn into one, He like-'wise signifies one flock joined together by 'the mingling of an united multitude' (**12**, 9).

181. These two quotations from Cyprian are plain contradictions of your more recent teaching. Mark his words, 'For when 'Christ says, "I am the true vine," the 'blood of Christ is assuredly not water, but 'wine.' But this you designate a sophism (section 173 above). In this instance, like other Fathers, he considered that the consecrated wine was no more the real blood of Christ than Christ was a real vine, and he evidently considered the phrase, 'This is 'my blood,' a metaphorical proposition, like the phrase, 'I am the true vine,' for he does not say 'wine is the blood of Christ,' but 'the blood of Christ is wine;' and he plainly says, 'The Lord calls His body bread, He 'calls His blood wine.'

182. Now, had you not suppressed these two important passages, your thoughtful readers would have seen that what you are pleased oracularly to call a sophism was actually used by Cyprian. Of all your eighty-two witnesses, so far as my examination of them has extended, there is not one whose testimony you have treated more unfairly than Cyprian's. But his testimony ought to be to you of more value than the united testimony of all your other witnesses, inas-

much as one divinely-inspired witness is of more value than any number of uninspired witnesses.

183. Of Cyprian you say, 'I do not, of 'course, deny *Christian* prophecy after the 'apostolic age, such as I myself have pointed 'out as having been vouchsafed to St. 'Cyprian, along the whole course of his 'episcopate.' *On Daniel*, p. 627, elsewhere you say, 'Add to this, that he whose "wit-'ness" he was, bore witness to him, after 'death, that he was seen thrice since in 'glory—once as one to whom it had been '"given to sit down on the throne" of the 'Judge, and people might well shrink from 'judging for themselves of his words, by 'whom, living, the Holy Spirit spake, and 'who is now an assessor of their Judge.'—*Preface to the Translation of Cyprian's Epistles*, pp. xxi., xxii.

184. That your treatment of a single epistle of Cyprian may be seen at one view, in addition to sections 179, 180 above, I shall now give your other quotations 'with 'so much of the context as is necessary for 'the clear exhibition of their meaning,' that it may be seen that, although 'people might 'well shrink from judging for themselves of 'Cyprian's words,' you, as one of the people, have not shrunk, whether knowingly or unknowingly, from making him a witness to what is not true, by quoting from him half of the truth, and suppressing the other half.

185. The following portion of the epistle is taken from the English translation of Cyprian's Epistles, of which you were one of the three editors, and to which you wrote a preface, and from it you have made your quotations. The parts given in italics distinguish your quotations from what you have not quoted.

186. 'That Melchizedech was a priest of 'the most High God, that he offered bread 'and wine, that he blessed Abraham. *For* '*who is more a Priest of the most High God* '*than our Lord Jesus Christ, who offered a* '*sacrifice to God the Father, and offered that* '*same which Melchizedech had offered, that is,* '*bread and wine, namely, His own Body and* '*Blood?* . . . In Genesis therefore, that the 'blessing of Abraham by Melchizedech the 'priest might be duly celebrated, the figure 'of the sacrifice of Christ goes before, ap-'pointed namely in bread and wine, which 'thing the Lord accomplishing and fulfilling, 'offered bread and the cup mixed with wine, 'and He who is the fulness of truth fulfilled 'the truth of the prefigured image.

187. 'Holy Scripture says, "He shall wash 'His garments in wine, and His clothes in 'the blood of grapes." *But when the blood* '*of grapes is mentioned, what else is shown* '[ostenditur] *than the wine of the cup of the* '*Blood of the Lord?* Moreover, in Isaiah, 'the Holy Spirit testifies this same of the 'Passion of the Lord, saying, "Wherefore 'art thou red in thine apparel and thy gar-'ments like him that treadeth in a wine-'vat?" Can water make apparel red? or is 'it water in the wine-vat which is trodden 'by the feet or squeezed out by the press? '*Mention is therefore made of wine, that the* '*blood of the Lord may be understood* [intelli-'gatur]; *and what was afterwards manifested* '*in the cup of the Lord might be foreshown in* '*the predictions of the Prophets. The treading* '*and pressure of the wine-vat is also dwelt* '*upon, because as men cannot come to the* '*drinking of wine unless the cluster be first* '*trodden and pressed, so neither could we* '*drink the blood of Christ unless Christ had* '*been first trodden on and pressed, and first* '*drank of the cup in which He should give* '*believers to drink.*

188. 'He taught that the cup should be 'mingled by the union of wine and water. 'For, taking the cup on the eve of His 'passion, He blessed it, and gave it to His 'disciples, saying, "Drink," &c. (Matt. xxvi. '27-29), wherein we find that the cup which 'the Lord offered was mixed, and that that 'was wine which He called His blood. 'Whence it is apparent that the blood of 'Christ is not offered if there is no wine in 'the cup, nor the sacrifice of the Lord cele-'brated by a legitimate consecration unless 'our oblation and sacrifice corresponds with 'His passion. But how shall we drink new 'wine of the fruit of the vine with Christ in 'the kingdom of the Father if in the sacrifice 'of God the Father and of Christ we do not 'offer wine, nor mingle the cup of the Lord 'according to the Lord's institution?

189. 'Since then neither the apostle him-'self nor an angel from heaven can preach or 'teach otherwise than Christ has once taught 'and His apostles preached, I marvel much 'whence this practice has arisen, that in some 'places, contrary to Evangelical and Apos-'tolic discipline, water is offered in the cup 'of the Lord, which alone cannot represent '[*exprimere*] the blood of Christ. . . . For 'that waters signify [*significare*] peoples Holy 'Scripture declares in the Revelations, say-'ing "The waters which thou sawest, on 'which the whore sitteth, are peoples, and 'multitudes, and nations, and tongues.

190. 'This too we perceive is contained in 'the mystery of the cup' [or, as better given in the Ante-Nicene Christian Library, '"na-'tions and tongues," which we evidently see 'to be contained also in the sacrament of the 'cup]. For because Christ loves us all in 'that He bore our sins also, we see that in 'the water the people are intended [*intelligi*, 'understood], but in the wine is shown '[*ostendi*] the Blood of Christ. But when in 'the cup water is mingled with the wine, 'His people are united to Christ, and the 'multitude of believers are united and con-'joined with Him in whom they believe. 'Which union and conjunction of water and

'wine is so mingled together in the cup of 'the Lord that that commixture cannot again 'be separated. . . . Thus then, in consecrat- 'ing the cup of the Lord, water alone cannot 'be offered, as neither can wine alone. For 'if any should offer wine alone, this is as 'though the blood of Christ were without 'us; but if there be water alone, the people 'begin to be without Christ. But when both 'are mingled, and by an infused union each 'is joined with the other, then the spiritual 'and heavenly sacrament is perfected. Thus 'then the cup of the Lord is not water alone 'or wine alone, unless both are mingled to- 'gether; as also the Body of the Lord can- 'not be meat [farina, meal, or flour] alone or 'water alone unless both be united and joined 'together and compacted into one cohering 'Bread. In which mystery [*sacramento*] also 'our people are shown [*ostenditur*] to be 'united, so that as many grains collected and 'ground and mingled together make one 'bread, so in Christ, who is the heavenly 'Bread, we may know that there is one 'Body wherewith our whole number is con- 'joined and united' (12, 4-7).

191. This teaching of Cyprian, whom you regard as inspired, contradicts nearly the whole of your teaching. You maintain, with Paschasius, the first promulgator of your doctrine, that the sacraments—that is, the visible and material signs in the Lord's Supper,—contain Christ's body and blood, and your three quotations appear to have been made to confirm that view. For instance, such phrases as 'Bread and wine, namely, 'His own body and blood;' 'The cup of the 'blood of the Lord;' 'Could we drink the 'blood of Christ?' But the same Cyprian speaks in a less qualified manner of the presence of Christ's people in the sacrament, in the bread, and in the cup. Thus he says, 'We evidently see the people to be contained 'also in the sacrament of the cup.' And as regards the cup, according to Cyprian, it should not contain water alone or wine alone, but should be a mixture of both. But the wine is the blood of Christ in the same sense as the water is the people of Christ. But the words of Cyprian forbid us to understand his language literally. For he teaches that water alone cannot *represent* the blood of Christ, but that the water *signifies* the people. You quote Cyprian as saying 'Mention is made of 'wine that the blood of the Lord *may be un- 'derstood*.' But he also says, 'We see that 'in the water the people *are understood*.' He further states, 'that in the wine *is shown* the 'blood of Christ;' and he also says, 'In the 'sacrament also our people *are shown* to be 'united.' In this epistle of Cyprian he certainly regards the propositions, 'This is my 'body,' 'This is my blood,' as figurative ones, for He says, 'That that was wine which 'He called His blood,' and he affirms that the cup of the Lord is not water alone, or wine alone, but wine and water, and that the body of Christ is not flour alone, or water alone, but both, that is bread. But so to regard the propositions in question you pronounce to be a sophism (section 173), and you in effect treat Cyprian, of whom you believe such marvellous things, as a sophist.

192. I am perplexed beyond all measure to account for your having 'not knowingly 'omitted' this portion of Cyprian's testimony, which is not only important in itself, but to you should be of supreme importance, as coming from a man whom you believe to have been inspired at the time he wrote, and from one who is to be an assessor of the Judge at the last day (section 183). No portion of patristic teaching in relation to the Lord's Supper was more commonly quoted, from the time of Augustine down to the tenth century.

193. It appears unaccountable that you should not have known how Bertram, in the ninth century, used it to refute your doctrine as first maintained by Paschasius. I entreat you to note well the use which Bertram made of Cyprian's teaching to refute the errors of Paschasius his abbot.

194. 'It is further to be considered, that 'in that bread not the body of Christ alone 'is figured, but also that of the people who 'believe in Him. Wherefore it is made of 'many grains of corn, as the body of faithful 'people is made up of many that believe 'through the word of Christ. For which 'reason, as that bread is taken to be the 'body of Christ in a mystery, so likewise are 'the members of the people that believe in 'Christ signified in a mystery. And as that 'bread is called the body of believers not 'corporally but spiritually, so also we must 'understand the body of Christ not cor- 'porally but spiritually. So, too, with the 'wine, which is called the blood of Christ, 'water is ordered to be mixed, nor is the 'one allowed to be offered without the other, 'because as the head cannot be without the 'body, nor the body without the head, so 'neither can the people be without Christ, 'nor Christ without the people. Moreover, 'the water in that part of the sacrament 'beareth the image of the people. If there- 'fore that wine, when consecrated by the 'office of the minister, is corporally changed 'into the blood of Christ, the water also 'which is mixed with it must necessarily be 'corporally changed into the blood of the 'faithful people. For where the consecra- 'tion is one, there followeth also one opera- 'tion; and where the cause is the same the 'mystery which followeth is the same also. 'But we see no change made in the water, 'as to bodily substance; and therefore, there 'is no corporal change in the wine. What- 'ever in the water signifieth the people of 'Christ is taken spiritually; whatever there- 'fore in the wine representeth the blood of

'Christ must be taken spiritually too.'—(25, 42-44.)

195. The testimony of Theodoret upon this point you have wrongly stated. I need only quote what you make him say, and state what he really says, and leave it to your own reflection.

196. You make him say in one and the same quotation from his writings: 'God 'hath called bread His own body, and *con-* '*trariwise* He hath called the flesh corn, . . . 'honoured the symbols which are seen with 'the title of bread and wine.'

197. But he really says: 'God entitled 'His own body bread, and *elsewhere* also 'named His flesh wheat. . . . He honoured 'the visible symbols with the title of body 'and blood' (23, 40).

198. Another important part of patristic testimony relating to this point, which you have passed over, is a passage in a commentary of St. Mark, which goes under the name of Jerome, and the passage is quoted as belonging to him in the *Catena Aurea* of Aquinas and in other works.

109. 'Jesus took bread and blessing 'broke, transfiguring His own body into 'bread' (18, 59).

200. Having justly blamed you for not fairly treating this part of the patristic testimony, it is right that I should notice what you have quoted which seems to bear upon the present point. You have quoted a very striking passage from that most evangelical author, Macarius of Egypt, and from the purpose to which you have applied it, it would appear that you believe that Christ did become bread, or did embody Himself in bread in the Lord's Supper. I will give your quotation first and your note after.

201. The Spirit of the Lord cometh to the 'refreshment of worthy souls, to their ex- 'ultation and delight and life everlasting. 'For the Lord *embodieth* Himself even into 'meat and drink (as it is written in the 'Gospel: "he that eateth this bread shall 'live for ever"), that He may ineffably rest 'the soul, and fill it with spiritual joy; for 'He saith: "I am the Bread of Life." In 'like way, also, He embodieth Himself into 'drink of a heavenly fountain, as He saith: '"he who drinketh of this water, which I 'shall give him, it shall be in him a fountain 'of living water, springing up unto eternal 'life." And "they all drink (saith he) of 'the same drink."'

202. Then you tell your readers, 'there is 'no special stress in this passage on the word '"*embodieth*," as though it expressed the '*mode* of the presence of our Lord in the 'Holy Eucharist. It does express an in- 'dwelling, so to speak, a Presence within 'the consecrated elements' (pp. 446-448).

203. Assuming as you do that Macarius is alluding to the '*meat*' of the Lord's Supper, then it follows, according to him, not that bread becomes the body of Christ, but that Christ becomes bread, or embodies Himself into bread, and hence Macarius quotes the words —'I am the bread of life.' The fountain to which Christ pointed the woman of Samaria, did not become Christ, but Christ became the fountain, or embodied Himself into it. Again, the water flowing from the rock in the wilderness, did not become Christ, but Christ became it, or embodied Himself into it.

204. You cannot believe that Macarius, the most enlightened and evangelical christian of his age, intended to teach that Christ really and truly became a fountain, or became the water which flowed from the rock in the wilderness, and if indeed Macarius, as you assume by the term '*meat*,' alludes to the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper, you cannot believe that he intended to teach that Christ really and truly became the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper, or was embodied into them. In all reason you must admit that in the three instances he either spoke literally, or figuratively, you cannot admit the former, you are compelled to admit the latter. And here I cannot but remark that if you will take the language of the Fathers literally, contrary to their own rules of interpretation, then you must often understand them as teaching that Christ's body and blood became bread and wine, and as teaching the real presence of Christ's body of believing people in the bread and wine.

205. From this digression, I go on again to point out to you some of the more striking instances of your unfair quotations. The Father who comes next in turn is Origen. You quote where he is speaking of the Sacramental bread, and the last part of your quotation is as follows:—'not the 'matter of the bread, but the words spoken 'over it is that which benefiteth him who 'eateth it not unworthily of the Lord, and 'this may be said of the typical and sym- 'bolical body' (11, 5). Here you stop and suppress the remaining part of the section which is, 'But many things might be spoken 'concerning the word Himself, also who 'became flesh and true food, which he who 'eateth shall certainly live for ever, no 'wicked man being able to eat it. For if 'it were possible that any one living in sin 'could eat Him who became flesh, being the 'word and living bread, it would not have 'been written, that "every one who eateth 'this bread shall live for ever."'

206. You teach that whoever receives 'the typical symbolical body,' or conse- crated bread, receives with it the real body of Christ, and so far as your quotation extends, there is no direct contradiction of your assumption, but much in your quotation which is inconsistent with it. But had you not suppressed what immediately follows your quotation, your readers would have

seen that no wicked man can eat the flesh or body of Christ, and that all who do eat it live for ever.

207. It appears very strange that you should have 'not knowingly omitted' this well-known passage. For although you might not know how often it has been quoted by our Reformers against your doctrine, yet when translating from the original, as you appear to have done, and coming so near to the end of the paragraph, it appears very careless on your part not to have cast your eye over the last six lines and a-half.

208. Another well-known passage from Origen, and commonly quoted by our Reformers, and which ought to have had a place in your list of quotations is the following:—

209. 'Nor do thou marvel because the 'Word of God is also called flesh and bread, 'and is called milk, and is called herbs, and 'for the capacity of believers, or the possi 'bility of their receiving Him, He is 'diversely named' (11, 21).

210. I come now to notice the manner in which you have treated a portion of the testimony of Ambrose. Quoting a long passage from him which does not appear to serve your purpose, and of which it would seem you were conscious, and therefore in order to give it point you preface it thus. S. Ambrose, on 'the other hand, speaks of 'the body of Christ as "signified" by the 'consecrated elements, and still more plainly 'in the well-known comparison of the '"shadow in the law, the image in the 'Gospel, the truth in the heavens." Unless 'there were a Real Presence, the Sacrament 'of the Gospel would be a less expressive 'shadow than the Paschal Lamb. Yet it is 'different, he says, from the truth. The 'Sacrament of the Gospel stands between 'the shadow in the law and the truth in the 'heavens, in that it has, like the law, a 'visible image, yet an image of the truth, 'not absent as in the law, but invisibly pre-'sent with us' (p. 454).

211. You then begin your quotation as follows:—'First, then, the shadow went 'before, the image followed, the truth *will* 'be.' You intend your readers to believe that Ambrose teaches that the truth or reality of the image is in or with it, in other words that in or with the consecrated elements is the body of Christ. But that is not instructing your readers but misleading them. For all that your quotation teaches is simply this, that the image of the Gospel is more instructive than the shadow of the law; but Ambrose no more teaches that the truth or reality is with or in the image of the Gospel, than the truth or reality is in or with the shadow of the law; and your readers would have seen this if you had not suppressed 'so much of the context as was 'necessary for the clear exhibition of its 'meaning.' Immediately after your quotation stand the following words:—'Ascend, 'therefore, O man, into heaven, and you 'shall see those things of which here was '*the shadow or the image*. You shall not 'see in part, not darkly, but in consumma-'tion, not in a veil, but in light. You shall 'see the true eternal light and perpetual 'Priest, the images of whom thou sawest 'here—Peter, Paul, John, James, Matthew, 'Thomas, you shall see a perfect man, not 'now in an image, but in truth or reality' (17, 7, 8).

212. You assume that the sacramental signs of the New Testament must be or contain that of which they are the signs in contradistinction to the sacramental signs of the Old Testament. You tell your readers that 'It is quite true that the outward elements 'are a figure of the inward substance' (35, 31). According to the Fathers it is quite true that the outward and inward elements, namely, the whole elements are figures of that which is external to them. Then you say, 'The question as to the elements them-'selves is not whether they are figures of 'His body *broken*, and of His blood *shed* for 'us. The very action of the Holy Eucharist 'shows that they are.' According to Holy Scripture, the Fathers, and all ancient Liturgies, the elements are not a figure of Christ's body *broken*, and of His blood *shed*, or the *shedding* of His blood, nor does the action of the Holy Eucharist show that they are (x. 89, 90).

213. Then you go on to say, 'The question 'so far is, whether they are a figure of what 'is present, although unseen, or of what is 'absent. But in these words of our Lord, '"This is my body," the question is, whether 'our Lord meant to express a spiritual reality, 'or whether, while He appeared to be speak-'ing of a gift which He was bestowing, He 'meant that He gave to His apostles and to 'us only a shadow, a rite as outward as any 'of the law, which He Himself came to fill 'up and fulfil. He Himself was the substance 'of the shadows of the law. He did not 'come to give us fresh shadows instead of 'realities' (35, 31).

214. According to the teaching of the Fathers the sacramental elements as figures no more contained that of which they were the figures than did certain figures of the Old Testament contain the things of which they were the figures. The teaching of the Fathers, and especially that of Augustine, in relation to this point, although commonly quoted by our Reformers, you have systematically ignored.

215. The following are a few instances of your omissions. Theodoret gives you a direct answer by anticipation, 'If the things of the 'Jews were a type of our things, which he 'confesses and does not deny, what need

'was there of a lamb of a year old after the 'sacrifice of the Lamb without spot, who 'hath taken away the sin of the world? 'And what was the use of the feast of un-'leavened bread after the heavenly Bread? 'Or of the typical Passover after the spiritual 'Passover? But he hears not the divine 'apostle saying, "Therefore let us keep the 'feast, not with old leaven, neither with the 'leaven of malice and wickedness, but with 'the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth. 'For Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us." 'Nor does he hear the Lord speaking to His 'disciples when he said "This is my body, 'which is broken for you, this do in remem-'brance of me." And, "This is my blood, 'which is shed for you for the remission of 'sins, this do in remembrance of me"' (23, 21).

216. Augustine especially gives a direct answer by anticipation to your plausible, but unsound argument. Speaking of the Israelites, he states, 'He says, "They ate the 'same spiritual meat." What means "the 'same" but that which we also eat? It had 'been sufficient to say that they ate spiritual 'meat. He says "the same." I know not 'how to understand the words "the same," 'but as meaning that which we also eat. 'What, then, says somebody, was this that 'manna which I now receive? Then nothing 'new has now come if it already was before. 'Therefore the offence of the cross is made 'void. . . . "Our Fathers," he says, "ate 'the same spiritual meat and drank the same 'spiritual drink." For there were those 'there who understood what they ate; there 'were those by whom Christ was tasted 'more in the heart than the manna in the 'mouth. . . . Therefore they drank the 'same drink as we do, but spiritual, that is, 'that which is taken by faith, not that which 'is drunk by the body. You have heard 'that it was the same drink. "The rock 'was Christ," for there was not one Christ 'then and another now. . . . But to the 'believer they were the same as now. For 'then Christ was about to come, now Christ 'has come. "About to come" and "has 'come" are different phrases, but it is the 'same Christ' (21, 111, 112).

217. Of Jewish and Christian sacramental rites he speaks thus, 'Those were promises 'of things to be fulfilled, these are tokens of 'things which are fulfilled' (21, 38).

218. Again answering some who, because 'the signs and sacraments have been changed since the coming of Christ, concluded that the things of the signs or sacraments must be changed also (which is very much like your argument), reasons thus: 'For if the 'sounds of words by which we speak are 'changed for the time, and the same things 'one while are announced about to be done, 'and at another as done, as these very two 'words which I have spoken, "About to be 'done" and "done," these neither bein 'equal intervals of delays, nor are the 'sounded with the same or as many letter 'or syllables. What wonder is it if th 'future passion and resurrection of Chris 'were promised by one kind of marks o 'mysteries, and the same when accomplishe 'are announced by another kind, since indeed 'the very words "about to be done," and '"done," "about to suffer," and "having 'suffered," can neither be extended equally 'or sounded alike. For what else are al 'corporal sacraments, but, as it were, certain 'visible words, very holy indeed, but never 'theless mutable and transient' (21, 39).

219. As if still arguing against you, he reasons thus—'For now it is not promised 'that He should be born, should suffer and 'should rise, which those Sacraments of the 'Jews in a certain manner (*quodam-modo*) 'proclaim aloud; but now it is announced 'that he was born, hath suffered, hath risen, 'which these Sacraments which are per-'formed by Christians now proclaim aloud.' (21, 40).

220. Again referring to the sacrifice of Christ, he states—'The flesh and blood of 'this sacrifice, before the coming of Christ, 'was promised by sacrifices of resemblances; 'in the passion of Christ, it was declared in 'the reality itself; after Christ's ascension 'it is solemnized by a Sacrament of re-'membrance' (21, 42).

221. Here you may learn from the plain testimony of Augustine the worthlessness of your argument. For he teaches that the Sacramental symbols in the Lord's Supper were no more the realities which they symbolized, than were the Sacramental symbols of the Jewish dispensation which symbolized the same realities. From the testimony of Augustine as adduced above (which forms no part of your patristic testimony), it is plain that he no more understood the phrase, 'This is my body,' literally than he understood the phrase, 'That Rock was 'Christ,' literally. He teaches also most distinctly that believers who rightly received the manna in the wilderness and the water from the rock, 'ate the spiritual meat 'which we do,' when, as believers, we rightly receive the Sacramental symbols of the Lord's Supper. You yourself have quoted from Augustine what I here quote again, '"This is the bread which came down 'from heaven." This bread the manna 'signified; this bread the altar of God doth 'signify. Those were Sacraments; in signs 'they are diverse, in the thing signified they 'are alike' (21, 77). Here Augustine teaches very plainly that the manna of the wilderness signified Christ the Bread of Life, and that the altar, meaning the Sacramental symbols, signified the same Divine Person, and that both were Sacraments in signs different, but they both signified the same

hing. It would be natural to infer that the very same reality which Christian believers receive in the Lord's Supper, Jewish believers received through the means of their signs which signified the same things. Your quotation provokes the desire for more. I will supply what you have suppressed. Augustine, after having made the statement which forms your quotation, immediately proceeds to confirm it in the following manner:—'Hear the apostle; "For I would 'not have you ignorant, brethren, that our 'fathers were all under the cloud, and all 'passed through the sea, and were all 'baptised unto Moses in the cloud and in 'the sea, and did all eat the same spiritual 'meat." Meaning of course that *as spiritual 'it was the same;* for as corporal it was 'another, because they ate manna, we some-'thing else; [consecrated bread and wine], 'but they ate the *spiritual meat which we do.* '. . . And he adds: "And did all drink the 'same spiritual drink." But in the visible 'form they drank one thing [water from the 'rock], we drink another [Sacramental 'wine], which, however, signifies this *same 'thing in its spiritual virtue.* For how was 'it "the same drink?" "They drank," 'saith he, "of the spiritual Rock that 'followed them, and that Rock was Christ"' (21, 77).

222. With Augustine, 'this bread is my 'body,' and 'that rock was Christ,' are analogous propositions and both alike figurative, and both, as you will have noticed, are used by Augustine to illustrate and confirm the reality of another figurative proposition (section 85, 86, 90). But in a very special manner Augustine shows the phrase—'that 'rock was Christ' to be a figurative proposition, he asks—'Why was Christ called 'a Lion? On account of courage. Why 'was He called a Rock? On account of 'firmness. Why was He called a Lamb? 'On account of innocency. . . . He who 'shall say that the rock was Christ in 'proper signification blasphemes' (27, 121 122).

223. I have not introduced this passage from Augustine for its own sake only, but also for a collateral reason. After Paschasius had introduced, at the beginning of the ninth century, for the first time, your doctrine into the church, it met, as was natural, with some opponents, among these was Ælfric, who is believed to have been Archbishop of Canterbury from 995 to 1005. In his homily, while apparently quoting a passage from Augustine, of which the above forms a part, he notably adds to the similies which Augustine applies to Christ, that of bread. He says—'Christ is said to be 'bread by signification, and a lamb, and a 'lion, and a mountain. He is called bread, 'because He is our life and angels' life. He 'is said to be a lamb for His innocency, and 'a lion for strength. But Christ is not so, 'notwithstanding, after true nature, neither '*bread,* nor a lamb, nor a lion. Why is then 'that holy housell called Christ's body, or 'His blood, if it be not truly what it is 'called?' (27, 4, 5).

224. It is almost unnecessary to remark that even supposing Augustine is altogether wrong in the analogies which he institutes between what he considers to be the Sacraments of the Israelites and the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, that in no respects impairs his testimony for our present purpose. Zwingle has pointed out analogies between the Sacraments of the Old Testament and those of the New, which are far more to the purpose than Augustine's. When Zwingle, as you know, desired to abolish the mass, and was on the point of succeeding, the Scribe told him that he had said indeed that Christ by the words—'this 'is my body,' meant, 'this signifies my 'body,' but that he had not sufficiently proved it by the testimonies of Scripture; for said he, whereas you have adduced, 'The 'seed is the word,' 'The field is the world,' &c. These make not for the purpose, for there Christ speaks parabolically; but this is no parable when He says, 'this is my 'body.' To this Zwingle made answer, that although He did not speak parabolically, yet He spoke figuratively. The remark of the Scribe produced a deep impression on the mind of Zwingle, and on retiring to rest, had a dream in which as quoted by you (35, 69, 34, 27), he was directed to what is written in Exodus xii., 11—'It is the 'Passover, *i. e.,* the passing over of the 'Lord.' 'This,' you say, 'Zwingle relates, 'dispersed all mist from the minds of the 'candidates of theology, who still somewhat 'hesitated on account of the difficulty as 'to parable.' Dr Wiseman, who narrated the dream before you, is very severe upon Zwingle on account of it, and represents him as a mad enthusiast, an idiot, an incoherent raver, a suggester of a palmary argument, a cheater, one that was led by a lying spirit (34, 27, 28). The dream surely was harmless and natural; for what is the subject of intense thought when awake, often lingers with us when asleep, and in the morning one may not only awake refreshed with sleep, but sometimes profited by one's dreams, not that anything new has been put into the mind, but something stored up in its hidden recesses has been evolved and brought to the surface. Most likely Zwingle had often read the text as it stood in the Latin vulgate. It is even probable that Zwingle had seen an exposition of it in the ordinary Roman Catholic commentary in common use in his day, if not also that of Tostatus, Bishop of Avila, both of which were admirably adapted to serve his purpose.

225. But to come to the point in hand,

you must admit that the analogy between the phrases 'It is the Lord's Passover,' and 'This is my body,' as first adduced by Zwingle, is much more to the point than the analogies adduced by Augustine. Your dislike of the analogy is so great, that probably from that cause you have not considered it as fully as it deserves. I shall therefore present it for your reconsideration.

226. Moses, in the institution of the Jewish Passover, stated, 'It (the paschal lamb), is 'the Lord's Passover.' Our Lord when instituting His own Passover, said, 'This '(bread) is my body.' The two propositions as figurative locutions are identically the same. There is this difference, however, the Lord instituted the Jewish feast by His servant Moses; Christ Himself instituted His own feast. Had he instituted it by His apostle Peter or any other servant, the form must have been altered accordingly. 'This 'bread is the Lord's body.' Or, had Moses instituted the Jewish Passover in the name of Jehovah, the form must have been altered thus: 'This (paschal lamb) is my Passover.' It is certain the lamb was not the event of the 'passing over,' but a memorial of it, or a sign which called attention to it. The same remark might be made respecting the consecrated bread in the Lord's Supper.

227. Of the many insuperable obstacles which stand in the way of a Scriptural intelligent belief of your doctrine of the real presence, this is not one of the least. Nevertheless you and Dr Wiseman affect to have removed it, he as the master and principal originator, and you as the cautious and wary disciple and assistant. I shall first notice your own part in it. You set about your task as follows:—'What reason then is there 'for not receiving the words "This is my 'body" as literally as the words "The word 'was with God," "The word was God?" 'It is worth observing in the outset, that in 'all explanations of Christ's plain words, '"This is my body," other than the simple 'affirmation which they are, the utmost 'claimed for such explanation is *possibility*. 'The necessity that they *must* mean some-'thing else than their simple meaning is 'postulated, and then analogies (as it is 'thought), are adduced to prove that they '*may*. But these alleged analogies all fail.

228. 'And first I need scarcely dwell upon 'the expression which Zwingle ascribes to a 'dream from GOD given to him as a ground 'for disproving the doctrine, the belief in 'which he had previously cast aside. "It 'is the Lord's Passover," which he explains 'to be, "It is a figure of the Lord's passing 'over." For the words without doubt mean, '"It is a Passover to the Lord," as in the 'fourth commandment it is said, "The 'seventh day is a [the] Sabbath to [of] the 'Lord," or again, "To-morrow is a feast to 'the Lord"' (35, 69).

229. To the words 'It is the Lord's Pas-over,' you add the following note, 'Zwingl 'knew no Hebrew; he speaks of verifyin 'the text of his dream in the LXX.'

230. I must do you the justice to say tha this part of your writings is a masterpiece i the line of things in which you most excel I shall begin, however, with what is plai and unequivocal first. You affirm 'Zwingl 'knew no Hebrew.' Here your meaning i quite plain, but the statement itself is simply and absolutely untrue. But whether h knew Hebrew or not, where could he bette exhibit the analogy between the phrase 'I '*is* the Lord's Passover,' as it occurs in the Greek Septuagint, and the phrase 'This *i* 'my body,' as it occurs in the Greek Testament? It is not practicable to exhibit the like analogy between the Hebrew and Greek, though a similar analogy might be exhibited between the Hebrew and the language which our Lord spoke. The Hebrew phrase in question, and the Syriac version of it, when compared with the Syriac version of our Lord's words, exhibit a striking analogy, which represented in English is as follows:—Hebrew and Syriac, 'Passover it the Lord's,' Syriac of the New Testament, 'This my 'body.' But your alleged analogous phrases to the phrase 'This is my body' are shown in the Syriac version not to be analogous at all, for as there given they are, 'The Word '*was* with God,' 'The Word *was* God.'

231. Most certainly Zwingle adopted the best and most legitimate course open to him, and even as a Hebrew scholar (for such he really was), he did all that he reasonably could do in that capacity, for in the very treatise from which you and Dr Wiseman have translated his dream, he points out the use and force of certain Hebrew words and remarks that, if the very words uttered by Christ had been given, neither we nor the Greek would have had the phrase 'This is 'my body,' but 'My body it,' for which he gives the Hebrew, and also the Hebrew for the analogous phrase 'Passover it,' which conception is substantially confirmed, as you have seen, by the most valuable and ancient Peshito Syriac version. Moreover, Zwingle has given very full annotations of Genesis and Exodus, which abound in Hebrew learning and criticism. He has also translated the whole of the Psalms from Hebrew, and the whole of Isaiah, and to the latter he has added a very full defence or commentary. A translation of Jeremiah and his Lamentations, with annotations thereon, completes the list of his Hebrew productions.

232. It was bad enough to affirm that Zwingle knew no Hebrew, but it is much worse to found upon it a misleading statement. You say that he explains, "It is the Lord's Passover," thus, "it is a figure of the 'Lord's passing over." For the words with-'out doubt mean, "It is a passover to the

'Lord."' This you treat as a misinterpretation of Zwingle, on the ground that he did not know Hebrew; but to a person like yourself, a professor of that language, the meaning of the phrase, 'It is the Lord's 'passover,' is not 'It is the figure of the 'Lord's passing over,' but 'It is a passover 'to the Lord.' Now there is no doubt as to what effect this teaching is likely to have upon your confiding readers who have not a fair knowledge of Hebrew. They can have no other impression than that the analogy between the phrase, 'It is the Lord's pas-'sover,' and the phrase, 'This is my body,' was invented by Zwingle, and founded upon his misinterpretation of the former phrase. Whereas all that Zwingle did was to point out the analogy which already existed, and which he neither created nor made. The real question is, Is the phrase, 'It is the Lord's pas-'sover,' an elliptical form of expression, or a proper form, a figurative or a literal form? You say, and say truly, that the words, 'It 'is the Lord's passover,' without doubt 'mean, "It is a passover to the Lord." This is a literal translation of the Hebrew, and a more emphatic manner of expressing that it is the *Lord's* passover that is, it really belongs to Him. The same remark applies to the other phrases which you quote (section 228), 'Sabbath to the Lord,' 'Feast 'to the Lord,'—that is, in both instances, of or belonging to the Lord—the Lord's. In the English version it is, 'The Sabbath *of* 'the Lord.' The other text, both in the Greek Septuagint and Latin Vulgate, is translated, 'Feast of the Lord.' As a Hebrew scholar, you know perfectly well that *to* the Lord, in that connection, is a more emphatic manner of expressing that which is *of*, or *belonging to*, the Lord—not necessarily anything done to Him.

233. Is it your intention that your readers should understand that you have quite refuted the criticism of Zwingle, when you have done nothing of the kind? But you do not fairly represent the criticism of Zwingle. You must be quite aware that we have no infallible mode of supplying the exact ellipsis of an elliptical phrase, or of giving the precise meaning of a figurative one. You appear to find fault with the *mode* in which Zwingle supplies the ellipsis, rather than prove that the phrase is not elliptical at all, and as if to make Zwingle's criticism contemptible, you appear to make him say what he does not say, and only quote the less important part of what he really does say. Thus, in your translation of Zwingle's dream, after the words, 'It is the Passover, '*i.e.*, the passing over of the Lord,' you interpolate the following remark—that is, as 'Zwingle explains it'—"It is the type of 'the Lord's passing over."' That is not his explanation. Then you represent him as saying, 'It is the figure of the Lord's pass-'ing over.' But what he really says is, 'That *est* (it is) denotes, "it signifies, or is 'a symbol or figure." Elsewhere you tell your readers, '"It is the Lord's Passover," 'does not mean, "it is the sign of the Lord's 'passing over." . . . The lamb was not a 'sign, and is not so called' (35, 27). You tell your readers what the phrase is not, but not what it is. You do not say it is not elliptical or figurative, nor do you prove that it is not so, although most of your readers might think so, and it would appear that you intended them so to think. Dr Wiseman, as you know, tried his hand at giving a new, and, up to that time, an unheard-of interpretation from the original Hebrew. That was a bold attempt, but you are aware as well as I am, that of the many and great difficulties which stand in the way of a scriptural and intelligent belief of your doctrine of the real presence, the plain analogy between the style of speech used in the institution of the Jewish Passover and that used in the institution of the Christian Passover, is by no means the least of the difficulties. But at what cost and after what manner Dr Wiseman accomplished his task, ought to be as well known to you as it is to me. It will be well for both of us to re-consider at what cost he accomplished his task, supposing he did accomplish it. He set up his own individual opinion as an interpreter of an important text which contradicted the interpretation of the Greek Septuagint, the ancient Italic version, his own Latin Vulgate, and the unanimous interpretation of such Latin and Greek Fathers as Tertullian, Origen, Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, Jerome, Gaudentius, Augustine, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Cyril of Alexandria. Discarding authorities like these, it was but a trifle to ignore all the authorities of the modern Roman Catholic Church down to his own time. The full evidence of this is given in chapter iv. To you and me, as ministers of a Protestant and Evangelical Church, the setting aside of such an array of authorities is of no fundamental importance, provided he could plainly prove from the Hebrew Scriptures that the phrase, 'It is the Lord's Passover,' is a proper and literal form of speech, and is not an elliptical or a figurative one. That he has miserably failed I am quite certain, and the grounds on which I come to that conclusion are given in the same fourth chapter. I do not underrate the brilliant talents of Dr Wiseman, but when such men attempt impossibilities and do not succeed, common folk cannot help noticing their failures.

234. Pardon me for dwelling upon the novel teaching of Dr Wiseman, for otherwise I could not form a just conception of your teaching, especially in regard to the particular point under investigation, for in truth Dr Wiseman's teaching herein is the foundation

of yours. He, the master, bold, rash, and daring; you, the disciple, but meek, wary, and insinuating. I do not mean that in all things you are the disciple of Wiseman, but more especially in his unfounded novelties. As a proof, compare **34**, 6 with **35**, 71; **34**, 18 with **35**, 69; **34**, 21-26 with **35**, 26-28; **34**, 27 with **35**, 69; **34**, 32, 33, with **35**, 27, 29.

235. This last comparison brings us to the very point under investigation. Dr Wiseman interprets the phrase, 'It is the Lord's 'Passover,' as meaning, 'This *is* the paschal 'feast sacred to the Lord,' and would confirm it by such examples as Exodus xx. 10, 'a Sabbath (sacred) to the Lord,' and xxxii. 5, 'a festival (sacred) to the Lord' (34, 32). Then Dr Wiseman with the most brazen assumption declares, 'But this rendering is 'placed beyond all controversy by a passage 'perfectly parallel, in the very chapter 'from which the objection is drawn, which, 'if Zwinglius had possessed the sagacity to 'compare, he would not have become the in-'strument of ensnaring his unlearned audi-'tors. I allude to the 27th verse' (**34**, 33). This unscrupulous and fiery doctor forgets that in imputing want of sagacity to Zwingle by implication, he imputes the same infirmity to every interpreter of the phrase in question, from Josephus and Philo down through all the Christian Fathers and more modern authors to his own time (iv. 26-44).

236. How very close you herein follow Dr Wiseman, may be seen by comparing your teaching as given in section 228 above with this of Dr Wiseman's.

237. I need make no apology for dwelling so long upon this point, for outside the words of institution, in the whole compass of Holy Scripture no phrase is of more value and importance in the interpretation of the words, 'This is my body,' than the phrase, 'It is 'the Lord's Passover.'

238. That Dr Wiseman has failed in accomplishing his task, I have an additional though indirect proof, in the fact that while you have followed him to a great extent, you have not in any definite manner adopted his bold conclusion. You have not ventured to contradict every known interpreter of the phrase down to Dr Wiseman, and with him maintain that the phrase, 'It is the Lord's 'Passover,' is a proper and literal form of speech, and is not an improper and figurative one.

239. Certainly the phrase, 'It is the Lord's 'Passover,' is vastly more likely to be analogous to the phrase, 'This is my body,' than the phrases, 'The Word was with God,' 'The 'Word was God,' as maintained by you and Dr Wiseman.—(**34**, 18; **35**, 69.)

240. I now call attention to one of your quotations from Augustine, as given below in italics, 'with so much of the con-'text added as is necessary for the clear 'exhibition of its meaning,' and your wrong translation corrected. Thus considered, I think you will yourself believe that there is no direct reference to a *sacramental* drinking of Christ's blood; most certainly, not to that only.

241. 'The same who in their rage had 'killed Him, being changed, believed in 'Him; and *the blood which in their raging* '*they had shed,* [BY] *believing* (credendo), *they* '*drank.*'—(**21**, 93.)

242. Did you leave out the word *by*, which is in the translation from which you professedly quote, and of which you are one of the editors, lest Augustine should seem to be against your doctrine, viz., that the blood of Christ must be received by the natural mouth? Augustine's doctrine here is very much like that of the xxviii. Article, viz. 'The mean 'whereby the body of Christ is received and 'eaten in the Supper, is faith,' if indeed he is referring to a sacramental participation at all.

243. You often mislead your readers by quoting Tertullian (**10**, 2), Cyprian (**12**, 1), and Augustine, where they interpret the phrase, 'Daily bread,' as it occurs in the Lord's Prayer in relation to Christ, as if it referred to sacramental bread only, and as if Christ could be received only by means of that bread, whereas it will appear that if the Fathers are fairly quoted, they by 'daily 'bread' do not exclusively denote sacramental bread, but bread of other kinds, by means of which Christ himself, the Bread of the sacrament, may be received as well as by means of the sacramental bread. The quotation from Augustine, as made by you, and given in italics, with its context, will serve as a specimen.

244. 'And the Word of God which is 'preached daily is bread. For, because it is 'not bread for the stomach, it is not ON that 'account not bread for the soul. But *when* '*this life shall have passed away, we shall* '*neither seek that bread which hunger seeks,* '*nor shall we have to receive the sacrament of* '*the altar, because we shall be there with* '*Christ, whose body we do now receive.* Nor 'will those words which we are now speak-'ing, need to be said to you, nor the sacred 'volume to be read, when we shall see Him, 'who is Himself the Word of God, by whom 'all things were made.'—(**21**, 118.)

245. Another illustration from Augustine will not be out of place. You quote as follows:—

246. 'There is a spiritual food also which 'the faithful know, which ye, too, will know, 'when ye shall receive it at the altar of God. 'This, also, is "daily bread," necessary only 'for this life. For shall we receive the 'Eucharist when we shall have come to 'Christ Himself, and begun to reign with 'Him for ever? So then the Eucharist is 'our daily bread; but let us in such wise

'receive it, that we be not refreshed in our 'bodies only but in our souls.'—(21, 120.)

247. Here you end your quotation, in consequence of which you omit to do what you affirm you have done, viz., 'given so much 'of the context as was necessary for the clear 'exhibition of its meaning.' For Augustine goes on to state:—

248. 'For the virtue which is there appre-'hended is unity, that gathered together 'into His body, and made His members, *we 'may be what we receive.* Then will be in-'deed our "daily bread." Again, what I 'am handling before you now is "daily 'bread," and the hymns ye hear and repeat 'are "daily bread." For all these are ne-'cessary in our state of pilgrimage. But 'when we shall have got thither, shall we 'hear the Book? We shall see the Word 'Himself, we shall hear the Word Himself, 'we shall eat Himself, we shall drink Him-'self,' &c.—(21, 120.)

249. Your extracts thus exhibited speak for themselves. You will notice a phrase in the part which you suppressed, namely, 'And made His members, we may be what 'we receive.' This doctrine forms an important part of the patristic testimony, but it has no place in the patristic testimony given by you. It is important for this reason, that if their language is to be taken literally, when they appear to speak of a presence in the consecrated elements, then they speak of the real presence of Christ's body of believers, more emphatically and with less qualification than they appear to do of the presence of Christ's body and blood in them. It is to be expected that when the Fathers especially explain the sacraments to communicants, the discourses containing those explanations must contain their most important testimony concerning the doctrine in dispute. Well, it so happens that you have quoted from some of those addresses where they appear to use language to suit your purpose, that is, to give your readers the impression that the Fathers believed the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements, but those parts of the same addresses where they appear to speak in the most unqualified manner of the presence of believers on the table and in the cup, those parts you studiously suppress. You quote from Augustine thus:—

250. 'This which ye see on the altar of God 'ye saw last night also; but what it was, what 'it meant, of how great a thing it contained 'the sacrament, ye have not yet heard. 'What ye see, then, is bread and a cup; 'what your eyes also report to you; but 'what your faith requires to be taught, the 'bread is the Body of Christ, the Cup the 'Blood of Christ. But some such thoughts 'as this may arise in the mind of some one, '"Our Lord Jesus Christ, we know whence 'He took flesh, of the Virgin Mary. He 'was nursed as an infant," &c. "He as-'cended into heaven;" thither He lifted aloft 'His body; thence He is to come to judge 'the quick and dead; there He is now sitting 'at the right hand of the Father. How is 'the bread His Body? And the cup, or 'what the cup contains, how is it His Blood? 'These things, brethren, are therefore called 'sacraments, because in them one thing is 'seen, another understood. What is seen 'hath a bodily form; what is understood 'hath a spiritual fruit.'—(21, 135.)

251. Such is your quotation, apparently a full, true, and particular explanation of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, which, however, in no respect serves your purpose. But can it be believed that you have suppressed the chief part of Augustine's testimony, and as if to give completeness to your quotation, and to avoid the necessity of quoting what to all would have appeared to be directly against your doctrine, you have suppressed the following words, which ought to have come in after the words 'blood of Christ,' in the above quotation:—'This, indeed, is but 'briefly stated, and it may suffice for faith, 'yet faith requireth instruction. For the 'prophet saith, "If ye will not believe ye 'shall not understand" (Isaiah vii. 9.) You 'may therefore say to me, thou hast bidden 'us to believe, explain that we may under-'stand,' &c.

252. Here it would be expected Augustine would explain to the communicants that they may understand and gratify their wish, but this you have almost entirely suppressed, in fact, you have wholly suppressed the most essential part. For, immediately after your quotation, Augustine goes on to say, 'If, 'then, you wish to understand the body of 'Christ, hear the apostle saying to the faith-'ful, "Ye are the body of Christ and His 'members." If, therefore, ye are the body 'of Christ and His members, the mystery '[sacrament] of yourselves is placed upon the 'Lord's table; ye receive the mysteries of 'yourselves. To that which ye are ye answer 'Amen, and by answering subscribe to it. 'For you hear "The body of Christ," and 'you answer Amen. Be a member of Christ's 'body, that your amen may be true. . . . Be 'what ye see, and take what ye are' (21, 136).

253. Augustine says much more to the same purpose, but the above is sufficient, and without any further remarks of my own, I will give you the remarks of Bertram, who quoted the whole of the passage in answer to Paschasius. He begins thus:—

254. 'Let me allege one other testimony 'of the Father Augustine, which will confirm 'what I have said, and conclude my discourse. 'In his sermon to the people concerning the 'sacrament of the Altar, he thus speaketh.' Here he gives your quotation, but includes the part which you suppressed, and remarks

upon it as follows,—'This venerable author, 'in these words, instructeth us what we 'ought to think of our Lord's proper body, 'which was born of Mary, &c., and what of 'that which is placed on the altar and re-'ceived by the people. The former is entire '—is neither cut nor divided, nor veiled 'under a figure; the latter, which is set on 'the Lord's table, is a figure, because it is a 'sacrament; as it is outwardly seen, it hath 'a corporal nature, which feedeth the body; 'as it is inwardly understood, it hath a 'spiritual fruit, which quickeneth the soul' (**25**, 58, 59).

255. Such are his remarks upon your quotation. The portion which you suppressed he introduces thus: 'When he would speak 'somewhat more openly and clearly of the 'mystical body, he addeth the following 'words.' After having given them, Bertram remarks on them, 'St Augustine sufficiently 'teacheth us that, in the bread which is 'placed on the altar, the Body of Christ is 'signified as well as the body of the people 'who receive, to the intent he might plainly 'show Christ's proper body to be that in 'which He was born of the Virgin, &c. But 'that which is placed on the Lord's table 'containeth the mystery [sacrament] of 'that body, as also again it containeth the 'mystery of the body of believing people, as 'the apostle testifieth, "We, being many, 'are one bread and one body in Christ."

256. 'Your wisdom, most illustrious prince, 'may understand that it hath been most 'clearly shown, by the testimony of the Holy 'Scripture and the words of the holy Fathers, 'that the bread, which is called the body of 'Christ, and the cup, which is called the 'blood of Christ, is a figure, because it is a 'mystery; and that the difference is not 'small between the body which existeth in 'mystery and the body which suffered, died, 'and rose again. For the one is the proper 'body of our Saviour; no figure, no hidden 'signification, but the manifestation of the 'reality itself is there acknowledged, and 'the vision of this, believers still desire (**25**, 60-62).

257. It seems surpassing strange that you should not knowingly have omitted this most important part of Augustine's testimony, especially as it is a part of his writings so well known from the fact that, from the time of Bertram downwards, and especially by our Reformers, it has been so commonly quoted against your doctrine. As it appears to me you must have vastly underrated the extent of your knowledge when you affirm 'I have suppressed nothing; I have not 'knowingly omitted anything; I have given 'every passage, as far as in me lay, with so 'much of the context as was necessary for 'the clear exhibition of its meaning' (section 29), you inform your readers that the passage which you quoted from Augustine (section 250) is 'incorporated by S. Fulgentius in one 'of his epistles.' And one would naturally suppose you would know the reason why he did incorporate it. And if so, your omission of it unknowingly is quite marvellous. But he did not merely incorporate in his letter the part you quoted, for that would not in the least have answered his purpose, not containing the special point which he wanted. In the sixth century, when superstition had prodigiously increased, and rites and ceremonies were greatly multiplied, and also an increasing importance attached to them, a question was mooted whether a believer in Christ could be saved who died without receiving the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist, since Christ Himself had said, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man 'and drink His blood, ye have no life in you.' Fulgentius, a leading bishop of that time, gives answer to this effect: that believers are made partakers of the body and blood of Christ before they receive them in the Eucharist. After having given very satisfactory evidence on the point, he concludes his letter thus, 'The blessed Augustine also made a 'very excellent sermon on this point, also 'suited for the edification and instruction of 'the faithful, which entire sermon I prefer 'to subjoin to my epistle.' He then quotes the sermon, and conclues thus:—

258. 'I think that my argument is con-'firmed by the sermon of the celebrated 'Doctor Augustine, and that there is no room 'for any one to doubt that each one of the 'faithful is then made a partaker of the body 'and blood of the Lord, when in baptism he 'is made a member of the body of Christ, 'and is not separated from that communion 'of the bread or cup, he may depart from 'this world belonging to the unity of the 'body of Christ. To wit, he is not deprived 'of the participation and benefit of that sacra-'ment when he himself is found *to be what* '*that sacrament signifies*' (**21**, 131-138).

259. Your knowledge appears to be very eclectic. You also instruct your readers that your quotation from Augustine is also incorporated by Florus as part of a commentary of the tenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. You appear desirous to impress your readers with the fame and importance of the passage. But Florus, like Fulgentius, has given your quotation without garbling it, and has fully quoted what you have suppressed, and not only so, but has also incorporated the very words of Fulgentius as quoted above (**24**, 26, 27).

260. But Florus does more, for a little after the quotation from Augustine, including your quotation, he cites from another sermon of Augustine's a passage equally fatal to your teaching.

261. 'Because Christ hath suffered for us, 'He hath commended unto us in this sacra-'ment His own body and blood, which also

'He hath even made us ourselves. For we 'also have been made His body, and through 'His mercy we are what we receive. . . . 'You have, as it were, come to the cup of 'the Lord, and there ye are on the table, 'and there ye are in the cup' (24, 28).

262. Had your knowledge extended to this most important part of Augustine's testimony, and had you at the same time framed your patristic testimony as you say you have done, doubtless that part of Augustine's testimony would have had a place in your 400 pages of extracts from the Fathers, and would have ruined the whole for the purpose alleged by you.

263. But before proceeding any further, I must have a few words with you respecting Florus the teacher. Had I known as much about him when I wrote my 'Answer to Dr 'Pusey's Challenge' as you knew, I certainly should have made more use of his teaching than I actually did in the refutation of your doctrine as held by Paschasius. Finding in the works of Bede a commentary on the Pauline Epistles wholly taken from the writings of Augustine, I naturally inferred that it belonged to Bede, and it was not until some time after that I learned it was really the work of Florus. I esteemed the work very highly as a skilful selection of passages from the writings of Augustine so as to make a commentary upon the Epistles of St Paul, and believing it to be the work of the venerable Bede, our greatest Anglican doctor of the seventh century and of any previous century, under that impression I quoted a large number of passages from him which subverted the Paschasian doctrine of the real presence, but as Paschasius did not promulgate his doctrine until more than 100 years after, I regarded that doctrine as being very remarkably confuted by anticipation. But as Florus did not live 100 years before Paschasius, but some years after him, the apparent confutation by anticipation is accounted for. You will find in the second volume of my 'Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge,' under the name of Bede, which please to change for the name of Florus, a multitude of passages quoted from Augustine, or references to the writings of Augustine quoted under his name (24, 24-36), and these bracketed to show what parts Florus had quoted, and in viii. 79-95 of the first volume you will find a full investigation of those passages and such evidence adduced as not only to confute your doctrine as a whole, but also in its various points. The quotations which you have made from Augustine in a garbled form, Florus has given correctly; passages of which you have quoted the least important part and suppressed the most important part, Florus has quoted fully. Very well known and most convincing passages commonly quoted against the Paschasian heresy which you have suppressed, Florus has given in all their crushing force against the doctrine of Paschasius, not omitting, of course, that well-known passage from Augustine which had not come within the compass of your knowledge (sections 36-42 above). In truth, I might have prefaced the evidence which I have given from Augustine as extracted from his writings by Florus in the same style in which you have prefaced your 400 pages of extracts from 82 authors, with this difference however, that what you randomly assert affirmatively of your 82 witnesses, viz., that they do teach the Paschasian doctrine, I soberly and without the fear of just contradiction might assert negatively of Augustine, namely, that he taught what was subversive of the Paschasian doctrine. Thus the following evidence, quoted by Florus from Augustine, 'that the belief of the real presence was' no 'part of the faith of' Augustine 'is more 'than enough to convince one who is willing 'to be convinced. If this convince not, 'neither would any other. There is no flaw, 'no doubt, I might almost say no loophole, 'except that man always finds one to escape 'what he is unwilling to accept' (sections 28, 29 above).

264. Nor is Florus the teacher, the only one who, in a commentary, in an uncontroversial manner confuted the doctrine of the real presence as held by Paschasius. Paschasius, abbot of the monastery of Corbey, wrote a commentary on St Matthew, in which he first promulgated his heresy on the real presence. Christian Druthmar, the grammarian, subsequently abbot of the same monastery, wrote a commentary on St Matthew, in which he not only ignored the doctrine of Paschasius, but taught what was destructive of it.

265. I revert to your quotations from the sacramental addresses, and here give another instance in which you quote a part of Augustine's address, and suppress the more important part.

266. 'I promised to you who have been 'baptised a sermon, in which I was to explain 'the sacrament of the Lord's Table, which 'ye have even now seen, and whereof ye 'became partakers last night [Evening Com-'munion]. Ye ought to know what ye have 'received, what ye are about to receive, 'what ye ought daily to receive. That 'bread which ye see on the Altar, sanctified 'by the Word of God, is the Body of Christ. 'That cup—rather what the cup holds—'sanctified by the Word of God, is the Blood 'of Christ. By these things the Lord Christ 'willed to commend His Body and Blood, 'which He shed for us for the remission of 'sins. If ye have well received, ye are what 'ye have received' (21, 126).

267. There you stop in the address of Augustine, leaving off at the very place where the thoughtful reader would feel a desire to know more. 'If ye have well re-

'ceived, ye are what ye have received'—that is, ye are Christ's body and blood. The remainder you have suppressed, in which he goes on to teach the very same doctrine which is quoted from him in sections 251, 261, above. I shall only give one or two short extracts as a specimen of the parts which you have suppressed. After your quotation, Augustine immediately goes on to say—

268. 'For the apostle says, "We being 'many, are one bread and one body." He 'so explains the sacrament of the Lord's 'table, "We being many, are one bread and 'one body." He commends in a certain 'manner to you in that bread to love unity '. . . Then the Holy Spirit approaches; 'after the water the fire, and ye were made 'bread which is the body of Christ. . . . 'Then after the consecration is said, in 'which (consecration) He willeth that we 'ourselves be His sacrifice, and that we be 'God's sacrifice, is that which is chiefly 'to be shown—that is, the sign of the thing 'which we are. . . . Let not that appear 'common to thee which thou seest. What 'thou seest passes away, but that which is 'signified is invisible, does not pass away, 'but remains. Lo it is received, it is eaten, 'it is consumed. Is the Church of Christ 'consumed? Are the members of Christ 'consumed? Never. Here they are made 'clean, there they are crowned. Therefore 'that which is signified shall remain eter-'nally, although it may seem to pass away' (21, 126, 127).

269. Your defective knowledge becomes increasingly marvellous in its manifestations, for in your two quotations from the sacramental addresses of Augustine, it has so happened that you should have knowingly quoted the less important part of those addresses, and unknowingly have suppressed the more important part.

270. You have quoted yet another sacramental address of Augustine. After giving the main part of your quotation, I shall be able to illustrate what you have quoted from that address, by what you have suppressed from the address just noticed.

272. 'What voice of the Lord have ye 'heard inviting us? Who invited? Whom 'did He invite? The Lord hath invited His 'slaves, and hath prepared for them Himself 'as their Food. Who would dare to eat his 'Lord? And yet He says, "He that eateth 'me, liveth by me" (John vi. 57). When 'Christ is eaten, life is eaten. Nor is He 'slain that He may be eaten, but He quicken-'eth the dead. When He is eaten, He re-'freshеth, and faileth not. Let us not then 'dread, brethren, to eat that Bread, for fear 'that we should finish It, and afterwards 'should not find what to eat. Let Christ be 'eaten; when eaten He lives; because when 'slain He rose again. And when we eat, we 'do not make it into parts [partes]; and in-'deed it so happens in the sacrament, and 'the faithful know how they eat the flesh 'of Christ. Each one receives his part '[partem], whence too the grace itself is called '"particles" [partes, parts]. In [per] parts 'He is eaten, and He, the whole, remaineth 'entire. By [per] parts He is eaten in the 'sacrament, and He, the whole, remaineth 'entire in heaven, He, the whole, remaineth 'entire in thy heart. . . . Let us eat, then, 'fearlessly. That which we eat is not con-'sumed. What is to eat Christ? It is not 'only to receive His body in the sacrament' (21, 139).

272. You inform your readers that 'some 'passages from the Fathers have been sup-'plied from the original, recently published 'by Dom Pitra and Card. Mai,' p. 315, and you introduce the above quotation as 'a 'fragment of a sermon of S. Augustine, pub-'lished by Cardinal Mai,' p. 540.

273. Florus has included it in his commentary, which is wholly taken from the writings of Augustine. Berengar, too, quoted it in answering what he called, not without reason, the arrogant silliness of Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, by which he meant the foolish Paschasian doctrine, of which he was one of the first and hottest defenders. How Berengar used a part of your quotation you will see by the remark which he throws in. 'When we eat Christ, we do 'not make parts of Him, which indeed is 'done in the sacrament; by parts He is 'eaten, and He the whole remaineth entire: 'by parts He is eaten in the sacrament, and '*He the whole remaineth entire in heaven.* 'He the whole remaineth entire, not in 'thy mouth, not in thy belly, *but in thy 'heart.*' *De Sacra Cœna Domini adversus Lanfrancum*, p. 237. In an earlier part of the same work he quotes the above words, and explains them by another quotation from Augustine, and one from Gregory the Great, as follows:—'He who eats in-'wardly, not outwardly, who eateth in the 'heart, not who presseth with his teeth;' and the blessed Gregory on Job. Thus 'be-'lieving,' he says, 'they desire to satisfy 'their hungering soul with the flesh of Christ 'through the daily sacrifice of immolation.' —*Ibid.*, p. 148.

274. Why have you translated a portion of your quotation as follows: 'And when 'we eat we do not make *it* into parts?' The proper translation is, 'And when we eat, we 'do not make parts of *Him*—that is, Christ '—as the context shows.' (Section 271.)

275. By your wrong translation you appear to take away the key of the whole passage, and to mystify your readers. Augustine, in all his remarks concerning the Lord's Supper, never confounds the sign with the thing signified, or so regards their union, that whoever receives the sign receives also

with it the thing signified, nor is the quotation given above an exception to the rule.

276. At the beginning of the quotation Augustine appears to use strong language, as founded upon the sixth chapter of St John. But Augustine himself forbids you to interpret that language literally, and teaches you to interpret it figuratively. By anticipation he has condemned your interpretation and that of Dr Wiseman (whom you seem to follow) as 'a disgraceful thing or a crime.' (Section 36 above.)

277. You cannot be too firmly convinced that Augustine in your quotation is not speaking of making parts and of not making parts of one and the same thing. He is really speaking of making parts of what Origen calls 'the typical and symbolical body (section 205 above), and not speaking of making parts of that which the typical and symbolical body represents—namely, Christ. Augustine doubtless distinguishes between the sacrament (meaning the consecrated bread) and that of which it is a sacrament, and for that reason Berengar and the Reformers used the passage against your comparatively modern doctrine, which does not admit of such a necessary distinction. If, however, you contend, from Augustine's style of language, that he believed the real presence of Christ's body in the consecrated elements, then from precisely the same form of language you must infer that he believed the real presence of Christ's body of believing people to be in them. You have only to compare what you omitted to quote in the sacramental address last noticed (section 268) with the part you have quoted from this, and you will be compelled either to believe a real presence in both instances, or a real presence in neither. In the former instance (section 268) Augustine is not speaking of eating and consuming one and the same thing, but of two different things—namely, the sacrament (the consecrated bread), and that of which it is a sacrament—that is, the members of the body of Christ. It cannot be questioned that Augustine in that passage is speaking of two kinds of eating—one literal as respects the sacrament (the consecrated bread), the other not literal, but spiritual and metaphorical, in regard to 'that which 'is signified, is invisible, does not pass away, 'but remains.' In the passage quoted by you, Augustine is likewise speaking of two kinds of eating—one literal in regard to the sacrament (the consecrated bread), which is eaten in parts, the other which is not literal, but spiritual and metaphorical in regard to that which is 'not made into parts, and the 'whole remaineth entire in heaven, entire in 'thy heart.' If you insist upon a literal eating of Christ in the consecrated bread in the passage which you have quoted, so you must also insist upon a literal eating of the members of Christ in the consecrated bread in the passage which you have suppressed. You cannot insist on the latter, you ought not to insist on the former.

278. In the very passage which you quote, Augustine, in the most distinct manner, distinguishes between eating the sacrament (consecrated elements) and eating Christ. Thus he asks, 'What is it to eat Christ? 'It is 'not only to receive His body in the sacra-'ment.'—(Section 271 above.)

279. Chrysostom teaches exactly the same doctrine as Augustine, and they, as do the Fathers generally, found that doctrine upon the reference of St Paul to the Lord's Supper in the tenth chapter of the First Epistle to the Corinthians.

280. The testimony of Chrysostom on this point you also treat most unfairly. I shall only give so much of your quotation as is necessary to exhibit the fault with which you are chargeable.

281. 'But that which He suffered not on 'the cross, this He suffers in the oblation for 'thy sake, and submits to be broken, that 'He may fill all men. . . . "For why do I 'speak of communion?" saith he, "we are 'that selfsame body." For what is the 'bread? The body of Christ. And what 'do they become who partake of It? The 'body of Christ; not many bodies, but one 'body. For as the bread, consisting of many 'grains, is made one, so that the grains no-'where appear; they exist, indeed, but their 'difference is not seen, by reason of their 'conjunction; so are we conjoined both with 'each other, and with Christ.'—(22, 20, 21.)

282. Plainly as this teaching is against your doctrine (for it does not favour the real presence of the body of Christ which was born of Mary, if the language is to be taken literally, but the real presence of Christ's body of believers in the consecrated bread), it would have been much plainer if you had not suppressed the following words, which should have appeared in the quotation where you have given the usual signs of an omission.

283. 'Further, because he said, "The com-'munion of the body," and that which com-'municates, is another thing from that where-'of it communicates; even this, which seem-'eth to be but a small difference, he took 'away. For, having said, "The communion 'of the body," he sought again to express 'something nearer. Wherefore he also 'added, "For we being many are one bread, 'one body."'

284. Here Chrysostom in the most distinct manner teaches, with Augustine, that believers, as the body of Christ and His members, are on the table, in the bread and in the cup, since he asserts that there is no difference between devout communicants and that of which they communicate, being that self-same body which they receive. Augustine, as you have seen, teaches that believers receive the mysteries of themselves from the

Lord's table, and solemnly assent to what they are, by saying, Amen. And thus they take what they are (Section 252 above.) That according to the teaching of Augustine, baptised true believers are found to be what the sacrament of the Lord's table signifies, although they have not received the consecrated elements (Section 258). Through God's mercy believers are what they receive, being as it were on the table and in the cup (Section 261). If believers have well received the consecrated elements, they are what they have received (Section 267). The quotation from Chrysostom, with your omission added, explains itself.

285. Leaving this, I come now to Theodoret, the last witness that I have to notice, and shall only call your attention to one striking instance in which you have, in the most flagrant manner, misrepresented his testimony. I shall give your quotation, with the parts suppressed in square brackets.

286. '*Orthodox.* The mystical *symbols* 'offered to God by the priests, whereof are 'they the *symbols? Eranistes.* Of the body 'and blood of the Lord. *Orth.* Of that 'which is indeed a body or no? *Eran.* Of 'that which is indeed. [*Orth.* Very right; 'for there must be an archetype of an image, 'for painters imitate nature, and draw the 'images of visible things. *Eran.* True.] '*Orth.* If, then, the Divine mysteries are '*antitypes* of that which is indeed a body, 'then now the body of the Lord is a body, 'and is not changed into the nature of the 'Godhead, but is filled with the Divine 'glory.'—(**23**, 43.)

287. I refrain from expressing any surmises as to how it came to pass that you suppressed from your quotation the above part inserted in brackets; but I must remark that the quotation, including the part which you omitted, is the most clear, conclusive, and indisputable refutation of your Paschasian doctrine, viz., that the consecrated elements, as mysteries, sacraments, types, antitypes, figures, symbols, or images, are, or contain that of which they are the mysteries, sacraments, types, &c. Theodoret in this dialogue shows that sacramental or mystical symbols are images, and states that an image must have an archetype—not that the image itself is, or contains the archetype, any more than images of visible things drawn by painters are themselves, or do themselves contain, the visible things. We cannot, then, infer that the antitypes, which Theodoret says the Divine mysteries [meaning the consecrated elements] are, are the true body of which they are the antitypes. The illustration which Theodoret uses, and which you suppressed, forbids such an outrageous conclusion.

288. Out of the ponderous tomes containing the writings of the fathers of the first five centuries, you have given a few instances (I suppose the best you could find) whic you think clearly teach your doctrine. It i only due to you that some of these should b examined.

289. You say, 'S. Basil, S. Gregory o 'Nazianzum, S. Macarius, Eusebius, Theo 'doret, Eustathius, S. Augustine say, as dic 'Tertullian, that the consecrated elements are 'symbols, types, antitypes, figures, images o 'our Lord's body and blood, as it is clear from 'their own writings they did *not* mean figures 'of an *absent* body, so also is it that they 'did mean that there was a real visible sub-'stance which was the image or symbol of 'the *present* spiritual, invisible substance.'

290. 'Tertullian says, "*In* the bread is un-'derstood His body."'—(**35**, 20.)

291. Tertullian is giving an exposition of the phrase 'daily bread,' as it occurs in the Lord's Prayer; and after having noticed its relation to earthly wants, he says, 'Although 'we may rather understand spiritually, '"Give us this day our daily bread." For 'Christ is our bread, because Christ is life 'and bread is life. "I am," saith He, "the 'bread of life;" and a little above, "The 'bread is the Word of the living God, which 'cometh down from heaven." Then again, 'because *in* the bread is understood (*censetur*) 'His body, "This is my body." Wherefore, 'in praying for "daily bread," we pray to be 'perpetually in Christ, and undivided from 'His body.'—(**10**, 2.)

292. The context undoubtedly shows that by the term bread Tertullian does not denote the material bread used in the Lord's Supper, and teach that the Lord's body is actually *in* it, but the word 'bread,' as it occurs in the Lord's Prayer, may be spiritually understood as signifying Christ the Bread of life, and Christ the Bread of the Lord's Supper. In another part of his writings he says, 'What 'now, if Christ be understood (*censetur*) *in* 'Daniel by this very title of "Son of Man?"' (x. 32.) He surely does not mean that Christ was really *in* Daniel, meaning in the words of the Book of Daniel. No more does he mean that the body of Christ was in the *word* 'bread' as it occurs in the Lord's Prayer.

293. You further state, 'S. Augustine 'says, "Our Lord Jesus Christ commended 'His body and blood *in* those things which 'are, out of many [many grains and many 'grapes], reduced into some one."'—(**35**, 20.)

294. You ought to have given this, your quotation, a place in your 400 pages of extracts, 'with so much of the context as was 'necessary for the clear exhibition of its 'meaning,' and you and your readers would have seen that your isolated extract does not in the least serve your purpose. See and examine it for yourself as here given.

295. 'By this meat and drink then, He 'would have to be understood the fellowship 'of His body and members, which is the

'Holy Church. . . . Save only this meat 'and drink, that is the very fellowship of 'the saints, which maketh them by whom it 'is taken to be immortal and incorruptible; 'where shall be peace and unity, full and 'perfect. For to this end (as also men of God 'who were before us have understood this 'matter) did [our Lord Jesus Christ com-'mend to us His body and blood in things 'which are out of many units reduced to 'some one whole. For out of many grains is 'several made into one, and several doth out 'of many berries flow into one]. . . This, then 'it is, to eat that meat and drink that drink, 'to dwell in Christ, and to have Christ dwell-'ing in him' (21, 82-84).

296. The quotation viewed in the light of the context, and more accurately translated as included in square brackets above, does not even seem to teach your doctrine. Augustine has no allusion to Christ's body and blood being in the consecrated elements, but teaches that by the sacramental elements, and especially by their composition, the union of believers with Christ and with one another is represented or signified. His doctrine is like that of Cyprian, to whom in fact he alludes. What that doctrine is may be seen in sections 179-181, 188-190, above where Cyprian very fully enters into the sacramental or symbolic significance of the composition of the bread and the mixture of the cup. And if, indeed, he teaches any real presence in the bread and in the cup, it is Christ's body of believers. Augustine teaches the very same doctrine in the above passage as that already considered in sections 252, 261, 268 above.

297. Two years after the publication of your sermon, when you had examined the writings of the Fathers more fully, you made additions to your stock of evidence in proof that the Fathers taught that the consecrated elements, as symbols, contained in them the things of which they were the symbols. That I may do you no injustice, I shall first give that evidence in a connected form, and afterwards examine it in its several parts.

298. You write, 'The word *in*, like the 'word of our Book of Homilies, "*under* 'the form of bread and wine," only expresses 'a real presence under that outward veil. 'But the term *does* imply the substance of 'the elements, *in* which the body and blood 'of our Lord are said to be. Passages from 'Tertullian . . . from S. Augustine . . . 'have already been given in the sermon it-'self (sections 289-293). In like way also S. 'Cyril of Jerusalem says, "*In* the type of 'bread is given to thee His body, and *in* the 'type of wine His blood." S. Augustine says 'again, "Receive ye that *in* the bread which 'hung on the cross; receive ye that *in* the 'cup which flowed from the side." S. Aug-'ustine again, as quoted in the "Sentences of 'Prosper," "We drink His blood *under* the 'form and flavour of wine." . . . Tertullian 'again, "He consecrated His blood *in* wine." '. . . S. Chrysostom says, "This which is '*in* the cup is that which flowed from the 'side, and thereof do we partake," and "the 'blood *in* the cup is drawn for thy cleansing 'from the undefiled side;" and S. Cyprian, '"Nor can His blood whereby we have been 'redeemed and quickened appear to be *in* 'the cup when the cup is without that wine, 'whereby the blood of Christ is *set forth*, as 'is declared, by the mystical meaning and 'testimony of all the Scriptures' (35, 33).

299. It is you, and not I, who have rendered the little word '*in*' so imposing, important, and impressive by setting it off in italics. How little, even with that expedient, it serves your purpose I will now show.

300. You surely misrepresent the Homilies when you represent the words 'under the 'form of bread and wine' as being a part of them. They only occur at the end of the first book of Homilies in an advertisement which is now obsolete. 'Hereafter shall 'follow sermons . . . of the due receiving of 'His blessed body and blood under the form 'of bread and wine.' At this date (1547) it is probable the author or authors might use the phrase, not in its original orthodox sense, but in the sense commonly used by Roman Catholics. But long afterwards (1563), when the English Church was purged from the comparatively modern Roman doctrine of the real presence, the homilies advertised were published, but the misleading title given above was replaced by the following title,—'Of the worthy Receiving of the Sacrament.' This is the title as given in the list, but the title at the head of the homily, and as quoted in our xxxv. article, is—'Of the worthy re-'ceiving and reverent esteeming of the Sac-'rament of the Body and Blood of Christ.' The homily is generally attributed to Bishop Jewel. But whether it is his or not, it repudiates the Paschasian or Roman doctrine of the real presence. The phrase then, properly speaking, is no part of our Book of Homilies. The phrase, too, in its original and proper sense, expresses the exact converse to that which you attribute to it, as I will show presently (section 324).

301. Your first quotation is from Cyril, which I will interpolate with the Latin translation. For *in* the figure [*sub specie*, under the form] of bread is given to thee His body, and *in* the figure [*sub specie*, under the form] of wine His blood.

302. You speak, and speak correctly, of 'Cyril calling the consecrated elements the '"type" or "antitype" of the body and 'blood of Christ,' p. 386. He, in fact, uses the words interchangeably. He calls baptism an antitype or figure of Christ's sufferings (15, 9). It is needless to remark that the water of baptism did not contain the death and burial. He calls chrism the antitype or figure of the Holy Ghost (15, 10). But the

Holy Ghost was not *in* the chrism, though Cyril called chrism the gift of Christ, meaning the Holy Ghost. You have correctly interpreted this part of Cyril's sacramental teaching. You have only to interpret his sacramental teaching concerning the type or antitype (meaning figure) of Christ's body and blood after the same manner (see section 104 above), and you will be quite certain your quotation in no respect answers your purpose, for it no more proves the real presence of Christ's body and blood is in the figure—the consecrated bread and wine—than the presence of death and burial is in the figure—the consecrated water—than the presence of the Holy Ghost is in the figure—the consecrated oil or chrism.

303. Your next quotation is—'S. Augus-'tine says again, "Receive ye that *in* the 'bread which hung on the cross; receive ye 'that *in* the cup which flowed from the 'side."'

304. If these are the words of Augustine, they admit of an easy explanation. But I have no proof that they are his words. They are not in his published works, and you do not pretend that they are—at least, you give your readers no reference where they are to be found. Out of the thousands of quotations which you have made, I have only noticed two or three instances where you omit to give any reference, and this is one of them, and another will occur presently. Now, it would have been better either to omit it or candidly tell your readers that you quoted it from Paschasius, the father of your doctrine, and that you understood it in the same sense that he did.

305. Your next quotation is,—'S. Augus-'tine again, as quoted in the "Sentences of 'Prosper," "We drink His blood *under* the 'form and flavour of wine."'

306. It must be confessed that these words teach, and were intended by their author to teach, your doctrine. But they are not to be found in the 388 sentences of Prosper, nor in any part of any one of them. In truth, they are not the words of Augustine at all, but of Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, the rabid defender of the doctrine of the real presence as held by Paschasius, and the words were used by him in a controversy with Berengar (see section 41 above).

307. Your next quotation is,—'Tertullian 'again, "He consecrated His blood *in* wine."'

308. This passage does not in the least serve your purpose. You require passages which seem to imply that the consecrated wine has become the blood of Christ, not passages which seem to imply that the body of Christ has become bread, or the blood of Christ has become wine. If Tertullian's language is taken literally, that is really the meaning of the phrase. But this phrase has been noticed by anticipation in sections 158-160, 169 above.

309. Another quotation is,—'S. Chryso-'tom says, "This which is *in* the cup is tha-'which flowed from the side, and thereof d-'we partake;" and "the blood *in* the cup i-'drawn for thy cleansing from the undefile-'side."'

310. I shall only notice the first of thes-extracts, as the second, although classed wit-the first under one reference, is not there t-be found, nor do you give it in your *catena* and whence you quote I know not. The firs-of these extracts has been answered by anti-cipation. For your quotation stands i-immediate connection with that part o-Chrysostom's writings noticed in sections 280-284 above, where he makes no distinction between those who communicate and that o-which they communicate. He says plainly, 'We are that self same body.' He would not affirm more of one part of the sacrament than of the other. Chrysostom is speaking of the marvellous and mysterious union of the body of true believers with Christ, so that whatever may be affirmed of Christ in regard to His human nature, the like things may be affirmed of the members of which He is the Head. Did He die and shed His blood, and arise, and sit at the right hand of the Father? So did all His members. Chrysostom, quoting the words, 'And gave Him to be Head 'over all things to the Church' (Eph. i., 22), exclaims—'Amazing! Look again whither 'He hath raised the Church! as though He 'were lifting it up by some engine. He hath 'raised it up to a vast height, and set it on 'yonder throne; for where the Head is, there 'is the body also. . . . "The fulness of 'Christ is the Church." And rightly, for 'the fulness of the Head is the body, and 'the fulness of the body is the Head.' I have not space to quote any more, but I must notice that the homily is on Christ's body the Church, and Chrysostom repeatedly says, 'Since our discourse is concerning the 'Lord's body,' meaning the Church. You quote one of the phrases and what immediately follows it, but after the words, 'Since 'our discourse is concerning the body,' you interpolate the words of Christ crucified so that what follows is made to appear to be said of the body which was born of Mary (to use a Paschasian phrase) and not of Christ's body the Church, and thus pervert the teaching of Chrysostom (22, 28, 29).

311. Your last quotation to be noticed is, 'S. Cyprian, "Nor can His blood whereby 'we have been redeemed and quickened 'appear to be *in* the cup, when the cup is 'without that wine whereby the blood of 'Christ is *set forth*, as is declared by the 'mystical meaning and testimony of all the 'Scriptures."'

312. The translation has only to be corrected, and 'So much of the context added 'as is necessary for the clear exhibition of its 'meaning,' and it will be seen that your

uotation from Cyprian is quite against the urpose for which you have quoted it. As hat has been done already in section 178-181 bove, it is not necessary to repeat it here.

313. I hope I have shown to your satisfac-ion that not one of the quotations which you ave adduced contains any proof whatever hat in the early Church it was believed that he type, antitype, figure, symbol, image, ign, &c., was that of which it was the type, c. Of course I make an exception to Lan-ranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, who was ot of the early Church, and was a furious isciple of Paschasius and a defender of his eresy.

314. From your quotations, however, I earn two things, that the Fathers did regard he consecrated elements as types, figures, ymbols, &c., of that of which they were the he types, &c., and that at the time you wrote ou accepted it for truth (1853-1855). But n 1871 you appear to call in question the ruth of this part of patristic testimony, for ou say, 'In the metaphor "I am the vine," truth is declared under symbolic or meta-phoric language. In our blessed Lord's words of institution, "This is my body," there is no mention of any symbol. He does not say "This bread is my body," but, "this thing, which I give you, is my body"' (35, 70).

315. Your language doubtless implies that f our Lord affirmed of bread 'This is my body,' there must be a symbol, and a figure of speech also, as Dr Wiseman himself ad-mits. But if our Lord affirmed not of bread, ut of this thing, now no longer bread, 'This is my body,' then bread is not a symbol; hen there is no figure of speech, but a form of expression as literal as the phrase 'The Word was God,' as Dr Wiseman and you ontend (section 32 above). I need not tell ou that this is Roman Catholic doctrine in ts most refined form, and all things con-idered, is a more credible and less absurd heory of the real presence of the body of Christ, which was born of Mary, in the con-ecrated elements, than any which as yet has been invented. But you have not fully avowed that you have become a believer of the doctrine of transubstantiation. I shall keep then to your earlier belief. About 1855 you believed, as the Fathers most certainly believed, that Christ affirmed of bread 'This ' is my body,' and as I have just noticed, you considered the consecrated elements to be figures, symbols, &c., of that which they signified, which also the Fathers believed and taught; but you, contrary to the Fathers, believed the symbols to be or to contain that of which they are the symbols, and in accord-ance with that view, you interpreted the words of institution not as you have done sub-sequently, but as follows:—'The proposition, ' "This bread is my body," could have no ' other meaning than that it was in some way ' both. "This, which is in its natural sub-' stance bread, is sacramentally my body, ' through the presence of my body under its ' form"' (35, 36). But why mar your other-wise perfect exposition of a part of the words of institution by foisting in the last clause, viz., 'Through the presence of my body under ' its form.' This is a most groundless assumption of which you have not given a vestige of proof. Not only so, but it makes your exposition absurd, inasmuch as one part of it flatly contradicts the other, and makes the words of our blessed Lord a pro-found absurdity. Your exposition of 1871, which has just been noticed, though the Roman one, must have been a great relief to your mind, as being much less absurd. I have said one part of your exposition plainly contradicts the other, and it does so on this wise. You say very truly 'This which in its ' natural substance is bread, is sacramentally ' my body.' But if the bread is sacramentally Christ's body, it is not really so, for the word sacramentally excludes the idea of the presence of Christ's body under the form of bread. That which is in its natural substance bread, when used in the Lord's Supper according to our blessed Lord's institution, becomes a mystery or sacrament. Which latter word, as used by the Fathers in rela-tion to the Lord's Supper, is the exact equivalent of the former, and as explained by Augustine, is the sign of a sacred thing (section 81 above). But the mystery or sacrament, that is, the sign of a sacred thing, is not the sacred thing itself; it is in the place of it, and is a certain proof of its absence therefrom. I need not tell you that when the Fathers designated the sacramental ele-ments, type, antitype, figure, symbol, image, likeness, sign, &c., they used those terms exactly in the same sense as they used the words mystery and sacrament in the same connection. Now by way of getting at the truth, I ask you did the Fathers when they designated the consecrated elements, type, &c, did they really believe that the type was that which it typified, the symbol that which it symbolised, the sign that which it signified, &c.? They most certainly did not. But if your doctrine were theirs, as you assume it to be, then they most certainly ought to have done so. So conscious were you of this, that nothing has been wanting on your part to make it appear that this is what the Fathers really do teach, and hence you have ransacked their ponderous tomes for evidence, and have quoted a few instances (I omit the spurious ones), where certain words occur, which by quoting so briefly as to conceal, or not to convey the meaning of the author, and by the aid of italics, doing your best to infuse your own meaning into them, you might convey to some of your readers that such Fathers as Tertullian, Cyprian, Cyril, Augustine, and Chrysostom

believed the body and blood of Christ to be really *in* the type, *in* the sign, or *in* the symbol of bread and wine.

316. But the type, symbol, sign, and figure, as designations of the consecrated elements, are exactly equivalent to the words mystery and sacrament as designations of the same things, and this you logically admit. You say very correctly, 'This, which is in 'substance bread, is *sacramentally* my body.' According to the plain teaching of the Fathers, you might substitute the word 'sacra-'mentally' by such terms as in type or typically, in symbol or symbolically, in figure or figuratively, in sign or significantly, &c., and the sense would remain exactly the same. But to add the sentence 'through the pre-'sence of my body under its form' would make nonsense of the whole, and would contradict the plainest teaching of the Fathers.

317. The early Church, you are aware, had four sacraments or mysteries—the consecrated bread and wine forming two sacraments, and baptism included two sacraments, for, in addition to the use of water, there was added consecrated oil, which was regarded as much a sacrament or mystery as the other three. This so-called sacrament or mystery has been discarded by all Protestant and Evangelical Churches (section 107). The early Church so defined the word sacrament or mystery that one definition applied equally to all, and each could be formulated in the same way. But you so formulate the sacrament of the Lord's Supper as to make it essentially different from the two other sacraments of the early Church,—that is, baptism and chrism. I have only to formulate the sacrament of chrism as you have formulated the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and you will see the contrast, which I presume you know quite as well as I do. You very truly tell your readers that Cyril of Jerusalem says that what is mere bread before its consecration after consecration is mere bread no longer, but 'the bread is the 'body of Christ,' and that what was simple ointment before its consecration, after consecration is simple ointment no longer, but 'the 'chrism *is* Christ's gift of grace' (35, 37).

318. The proposition 'the chrism *is* Christ's 'gift of grace' could have no other meaning than that it was in some way both. 'The 'chrism,' which in its natural substance is ointment, is sacramentally Christ's gift of grace, through the presence of Christ's gift of grace under its form. It is needless to remark that you do not believe that Christ's gift of grace, that is, the Holy Ghost, is in the chrism, for it has been shown, in section 104 above, that you plainly say that chrism is not the gift of grace, for Cyril only 'calls 'the chrism by the name of the grace which 'it conveys.' You would have been nearer truth if you had said, he calls chrism by the name of the grace which it represents signifies.

319. Augustine says St Paul does not sa 'we signify burial, but says outright we a 'buried' (section 87,). The propositio 'baptism is burial' could have no oth meaning than that it was in some way both Baptism, which in its natural substance water applied to the body, is sacramentall burial or 'a death unto sin and a new birt 'unto righteousness,' through the presenc of burial or a death unto sin and a new birt unto righteousness under its form. You can not, and do not, admit that baptism i any more that which it represents or signifie than chrism is that which it represents o signifies. If you really followed the teachin of the early Church, as you profess to do which had but one definition of a sacramen or mystery, that was equally applicable to al four sacraments, you would no more regar consecrated bread and consecrated wine which were called sacraments or mysteries as containing, under their form, the presenc of that which they represent or signify, tha consecrated oil and consecrated water, whic were called sacraments or mysteries, as containing, under their form, the presence o that which they represent or signify. In fact, your interpreting the word sacrament in relation to the Lord's supper, so as to include in it (the material substances) the body and blood of Christ, is not the doctrine of the early Church at all, but the doctrine of Paschasius Radbert, who lived in the ninth century. You can give no earlier origin of it, no earlier authority for it.

320. But I must advance a step further. Augustine, the middle and both ends of all human authority in the early Church, taught that the sacraments of the Israelites (for such he really calls them) were exactly the same in what they represented or signified as the consecrated bread and wine of the Lord's Supper. And not only so, but to convince an opponent that where Holy Scripture calls blood life, such language is to be understood figuratively and not literally, he shows it must be understood, after the manner of such phrases as 'That Rock was Christ,' 'This is 'my body,' 'Christ not hesitating to say, '"This is my body," when He gave a sign of 'His body.' It is true this teaching of Augustine forms no part of your 400 pages of extracts from the Fathers, and according to your own statement its absence therefrom must have been owing to its not having come within the range of your knowledge. It nevertheless exists, and I will now turn it to account. Bearing in mind that we have two independent proofs (probably many more) from Augustine that he considered the phrase 'That Rock was Christ,' to be a form of speech exactly analogous to the words of institution, and consequently no more could be affirmed of the latter than of the former,

one than of the other. I have only then formulate the phrase 'That Rock was Christ,' as you have formulated 'This bread s my body,' and you will plainly see how ien your teaching is from that of Augustine.

321. The proposition 'That Rock was Christ,' could have no other meaning than at it was in some way both. 'That Rock,' leaning the water which flowed from it) as in its natural substance water, was cramentally Christ, through the presence Christ under its form.

322. You cannot and do not believe that the water from the Rock there was the al objective presence of Christ. Nay, you ll your readers truly and plainly 'St Paul spake in a figure' (35, 15). No more, cording to the teaching of Augustine, ght you to believe that in the consecrated read and wine is there the real objective resence of Christ's body and blood, and erewith, His soul, body, and divinity, for u truly say, in reference to this very ing, 'since His body is there, there must His soul be also, there also His divinity. For they are inseparable' (35, 68).

323. It must be confessed, however, that e analogies between certain things in the ld Testament which Augustine calls sacraents, and the sacraments of the Lord's upper, are of no real value, excepting as ey prove beyond all doubt that the Pasasian doctrine of the real presence was holly unknown to him. But the analogy, obably first pointed out by Zwingle, beween the institution of the Jewish Passover id the institution of the Christian Passover, of intrinsic value, because it rests on the thority of Holy Scripture. I have only formulate the institution of the Jewish assover after the same manner in which u have formulated the Christian Passover, id it will be seen that you differ not only om the teaching of the Fathers, but from e plain doctrine of Holy Scripture also. he proposition, 'It [the lamb, its sacrifice, or the feast] is the Lord's Passover,' could ve no other meaning than that it was in me way both. 'It, the lamb, its sacrifice, the feast,' which was in its natural subance food for the body, was sacramentally e Lord's Passover, or the passing over of e Lord, through the passing over of the ord under its form.

324. There is only one other point which must notice, as promised in section 300, id it is this—you have distinctly and rrectly admitted that the Fathers comonly designate the consecrated elements pe, antitype, figure, symbol, likeness, or gn, &c.; and it has been shown in sections 9 313 above, that you have made an abore attempt to prove that when the Fathers use such phraseology as *in* or *under* the type *in* or *under* the figure, &c., in relation to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, they actually meant by this style of speech that the body and blood of Christ were really present *in* or *under* the type, antitype, symbol, &c., whereas it has been shown that this style of speech proves not the real presence in the type of that of which it is a type, in the antitype of that of which it is an antitype, in the symbol of that of which it is a symbol, but the real absence therefrom. But the phrase, 'in' or 'under the form of,' as commonly used by the Latin Fathers, is exactly analogous in use and signification to such phrases as 'in' or 'under the type of,' as given above, and those phrases in the Greek Fathers are commonly rendered in the Latin translations by the phrase 'under 'the form of.' An instance occurs in section 301 above. Thus, then, all the various symbolical terms of the Greek Fathers, as well as some used by the Latin Fathers, might be substituted by the word *form*, without affecting the sense as follows. The body or blood in or under the form (the type), in or under the form (the antitype), in or under the form (the figure, symbol, image, likeness, &c.) of bread and wine. Thus the phrase, 'The body and blood of 'Christ under the form of bread and wine,' which appears so frequently in your writings and in those of your disciples, ticketed with marks of quotation as coming from the book of Homilies, or rather from an obsolete advertisement of the same, instead of teaching your doctrine, teaches the reverse—that is, the real absence from the consecrated elements of what you believe to be present in them—and in this sense the phrase was used in Latin both by Zwingle and Calvin.

325. I have now given a fair specimen of the manner in which you have treated the testimony of the Fathers and a fraction of the evidence which can be adduced to show that they taught what is subversive of your doctrine of the real presence. Your book has been published more than twenty years. I have shown elsewhere with what implicit confidence leaders in the real presence controversy have accepted for truth what you represent the Fathers as teaching concerning that doctrine. How great may be the number of those of less note who have accepted your patristic testimony as trustworthy, I have no means of knowing. It would be affectation to call upon you to vindicate the manner in which you have treated that testimony, but I do call upon you to give some explanation.

JOHN HARRISON, D.D.

Askern, near Doncaster.

Short extracts from Reviews of the work entitled, "The Fathers *versus* Dr Pusey An exposure of his unfair treatment of their evidence on the doctrine of the Real Presence," by John Harrison, D.D., Vicar of Fenwick, near Doncaster, author of "Whose are the Fathers?" "An answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge respecting the Doctrine of the Real Presence;" "On the Primitive Mode of making Bishops," &c. Price 6s. *London: Longmans, Green, & Co.*, 1873.

The Christian Age.—"Romanists and Ritualists have no more formidable opponent than the author of this work. His 'Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge respecting the doctrine of the Real Presence,' and 'Whose are the Fathers?' have placed him in the first rank of modern controversialists."

The Rock.—"In order to expose the unfair treatment of the supposed testimony of the Fathers upon the doctrine of the Real Presence, the author in this small treatise enters very lucidly into the false and garbled quotations given by Dr Pusey from the sources of patristic theology. We confess that we are unable to see how Dr Pusey can escape from the verdict which every honest man must give against him in this respect. He is, without the shadow of a doubt, guilty of flagrant misquotations and mistranslation. We commend this work to all our readers whether lay or clerical."

Daily Review.—"Dr Harrison deals chiefly with Dr Pusey as an acknowledged leader among the Ritualists, and shows that they have been misled by his false quotations. The charge of unfaithfulness is conclusively established against Dr Pusey. Dr Harrison has rendered good service in turning Dr Pusey's authorities completely against him; and we commend this elaborate refutation to all interested in the controversy."

English Independent.—"Dr Harrison shows, with much learning, critical acumen, and great success, that there is another side to that which Dr Pusey and his friend so constantly present. It is a very masterly bit of work."

Short extracts from seven out of thirty-eight Reviews of the work entitled, "Whose are the Fathers?" or the teaching of certain Anglo-Catholics on the Church and its ministry, contrary alike to the Holy Scriptures, to the Fathers of the first six centuries, and of the English Church of the latter half of the sixteenth century. Price 16s, *Longmans, Green, & Co.*, 1867.

The London Quarterly Review.—"The result is a comprehensive, learned, and almost exhaustive work of more than 300 pages of 'Catena,' consisting of careful quotations from the Fathers, &c., are prepared with conscientious care and astonishing industry. The volume is well worth having for their sake alone; but they are only adduced as illustration of an argument which seems to our rapid glance at least sound and clear."

The Journal of Sacred Literature.—"This is an exceedingly good book, and likely enough to be useful in these days of ritual extravagance."

The British Quarterly Review.—"Mr Harrison's Book is a valuable magazine of patristic reference for combatants on his side the question. It meets the Ritualists on their own chosen ground."

The Athenæum.—"When Job wished that his adversary had written a book, it was said before books of reference were in existence, he did not contemplate an opponent collecting dry facts or opinions against him, with an index. It gets into the quiet country library, and is used for many a year against the 'little book of nonsense,' as Sydney Smith called it."

The Record.—"He seems to be well acquainted with all that the High-Anglicans have written on the subject, and in the course of his arguments he exposes the astonishing misquotations and mis-statements which such learned men as Dean Hook, and even Archdeacon Wordsworth, have been led into by a prejudiced judgment, or by the heat of controversy."

The Rock.—"The whole work is literally a monument of the author's learning, sagacity and industry."

The Christian Advocate and Review.—The learned author of the volume before us has brought this alleged antiquity to the test of strict examination and comparison with the whole course and tenure of the early Christian writers, both Greek and Latin. . . . We are glad to find that it is gaining a place for itself as an authority and book of reference on the subject of which it treats."

Short extracts from thirteen out of thirty-two Reviews of the work entitled, "An Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge respecting the Doctrine of the Real Presence," in which the Doctrines of the Lord's Supper, as held by him, Roman and Greek Catholics, Ritualists, and High Anglo-Catholics, are examined and shown to be contrary to the Holy Scriptures and to the teaching of the Fathers of the first eight centuries, with the testimony of an ample Catena Patrum of the same period, by John Harrison, D.D. In two volumes, pp. 1082, price 21s. *London: Longmans, Green, & Co.*

The English Churchman and Clerical Journal.—"With a great exhibition of learning, Dr Harrison shows that the sentiments of the Regius Professor have been contradicted and impugned by a long series of writers and doctors."

The Bulwark or Reformation Journal.—"This is a book of great ability and immense learning and it completely demolishes the assertion of Dr Pusey, to the effect that what is called the doctrine of the 'Real Presence' in the Lord's Supper was generally held in the Primitive Church."

The Evening Standard.—"Dr Harrison appears to be a well-read, well-armed Scholar; that he has clearly expended on this present work much time, honest labour, and talents of no mean order. . . . In Patristic divinity, indeed, he seems to be an antagonist well worthy of Dr Pusey's highest consideration, being equally well-read and skilful, as an opponent."

The Spectator.—"Dr Harrison's book is one which shows great learning and industry; nor have we any doubt, that, on the whole, he has the best of the argument."

The Christian Advocate and Review.—"The quotations of Dr Pusey are not trustworthy. . . . But the fact appears to us to be indisputable, and Dr Harrison's bulky volumes teem with evidences of it. . . . We are indebted much to the industry and learning of Dr Harrison for the elucidation of this statement supplied in his valuable volumes,"

British Quarterly Review.—"This prodigious title adequately describes this vast and elaborate work. . . . Dr Harrison proceeds to prove in detail, that the Fathers of the first 450 years, including Augustine, lend no countenance to the Roman or Anglican theory of the Real Presence in the elements. He refutes Sir R. Phillimore's judgment that Mr Bennett's doctrine of the Supper is identical with that of Bertram rather than with that of Paschasius. He shows by elaborate quotation and comment that Augustine teaches that the sacramental signs of the Eucharist are no more the flesh and blood of Christ, or contain them, than the *signs*, whether written or spoken, which convey to us the word of God, are, or contain, His body and blood. . . . He vindicates Zwingle from pure Zwinglianism, and openly and bravely exposes the false charges brought by Sir R. Phillimore and Canon Liddon against the doctrine of Zwingle. . . . We feel that Dr Harrison has won for himself a high place in the esteem of truth-loving men. . . . We heartily thank Dr Harrison for his laborious, learned, and exhaustive work."

The Rock.—"Dr Harrison has now concentrated his forces, and made a brave and successful attack on the camp of the enemy; and if the foes of the Church in its Protestant and Evangelical character are not broken and dispersed, it will be because they do not know when they are beaten, or refuse to acknowledge the defeat. . . . Dr Harrison has discharged his very arduous task in a manner which deserves high praise, and we hope the work will be at once regarded as a text-book on the controversy it treats of. Incidentally, it supplies a vast deal of general information on patristic learning and general theology."

London Quarterly Review.—"These ponderous volumes have the same characteristics which we indicated in the author's 'Whose are the Fathers?' They exhaust the subject; exhibiting every opinion and shade of opinion, that has ever had a place in the history of Christian doctrine concerning the Eucharist. Dr Harrison has produced a work which brings the whole question of the Eucharist before the reader in a way which has no parallel in English theological literature."

Record.—"The author has, in his former work, 'Whose are the Fathers?' shown his fitness for such a work as this present one, which is a monument of industry; not however, useless as many a monument is, but of well bestowed

labour, resulting in a real Galeed or heap of witness to the truth. . . . It would be almost as easy to review a cyclopædia as the work before us, so full is it of matter. . . . The quotations made by Dr Pusey are here printed in brackets, so as to show what he had 'omitted, his garbled extracts, unfair translations, and unaccountable omissions; and the shrewd remark is made that 'nearly the whole of Dr Pusey's evidence from the Fathers consists of sacramental phrases in which the signs take the names of the things which they signify.' Of this fact our author makes powerful use, and having established, beyond the shadow of a doubt, chiefly by the testimony of Augustine, that this was a recognised and general patristic usage to give the names of the things which are signified to the things which signify them—he goes on to dissipate the array of evidence that seemed to support the Romish doctrine, and has an easy task. . . . There are many points besides these above noticed on which we could dwell, but failing space warns us to admonish all who can to possess themselves of these valuable octavos, and to study them as they have been written, with patience. If Dr Pusey has displayed some of the mischievous and perverse genius of Napoleon in leading men to war, Dr Harrison has shown the wholesome common-sense ability of Wellington in tracking and overthrowing the disturber of peace."

The Church Association Monthly Intelligencer.—"The above named work is a sufficient reply to Dr Dollinger's averment that the Evangelical clergy of the Church of England have only produced a popular not a scientific theological literature. We are thankful to know that the mantle of Dean Goode has fallen on one so fit to tread in his footsteps. . . . We do not doubt that the 'Answer to Dr Pusey's Challenge' will soon take the first rank in the literature of the Sacraments. Dr Harrison has added to the laurels he gained by 'Whose are the Fathers?' We wish he were placed in a position of influence where he could yet more abidingly mould and guide public opinion."

Christian Observer.—"We agree with Dr Harrison, that the doctrine now advocated by Dr Pusey and his followers, was as unknown to the Fathers of the first six centuries as was that of the Romanists in the days of Bishop Jewel, to which it bears so close an affinity. We agree further with Dr Harrison that Dr Pusey's citations are unsatisfactory in every respect, inasmuch as in some instances he does not quote enough of the context to enable his readers to form a fair judgment of the meaning of the writer, and in other cases the meaning of words and phrases, in themselves ambiguous, is clearly imported by Dr Pusey into them, and not by any satisfactory process of exegesis extracted out of them. . . . In the course of his examination of the Romish and Ritualistic theories on the subject of the Real Presence, he not only exposes much of unsound Scriptural interpretation and illogical argument, but also throws much light upon the history and meaning of words and phrases, not as 'under the form of bread and wine,' which have been so eagerly, not to say unscrupulously, employed by those who maintain what is now commonly known as the doctrine of the *real objective presence* of the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper."

Church and State, (New York.)—"Dr Harrison has written a great book—as well as a large one. He seems to have completely demolished the patristic foundation of what seems to be Dr Pusey's doctrine of the Eucharist, or rather of the Real Presence. . . . The Catena Patrum, which occupies nearly the whole of Dr Harrison's second volume, is very valuable; and in our judgment much superior to Dr Pusey's testimonies. The passages are fairly selected, translated, however, with too harsh a literalness. The references also, for verification, are full and accurate. Dr Pusey's witnesses are rigorously cross-examined, with very damaging effects for Dr Pusey's theory. . . . On one side this book is of special value for the clergy; not only as a storehouse of patristic learning, but as an example. It is of no use now-a-days playing on the surface of great questions; we must go to the bottom of them. The clergy must have their proofs and evidences at hand; 'somewhere or other,' either in their libraries or their heads. . . . In a brief notice like this, we can do no full justice to Dr Harrison's work; but we can testify, not without careful examination, and certainly without an atom of prejudice in its favour, that it will abundantly repay careful study."

Extracts from Reviews of the work entitled, "An Answer, in Seven Tracts, to the Eucharistic Doctrine of Romanists and Ritualists, in which it is shown that their teaching is contrary to Holy Scripture and unknown to the Fathers." Price 4s. *London: Longmans, Green, & Co.*, 1876.

The Evening Standard.—"Dr Harrison is an able controversialist, and he makes it very clear, from the authorities here quoted, that the extreme doctrine of a real objective bodily presence in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper is neither the doctrine of the Church of England, as expressed in her formularies, nor the doctrine of the Primitive Church, as shown by the writings of the early Fathers, when that Church was at its purest and its best."

British and Foreign Evangelical Review.—"The author's extensive study of the early Christian writers enables him to show that the peculiar views of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, held by the priestly party, have not the support in antiquity for which they contend."

Weekly Review.—"If men will go to the Fathers, they cannot go in better company than that of Dr Harrison. The seven tracts bear abundant evidence that he has studied them thoroughly, and has used them most effectively against the whole host of Romanists and Ritualists who, by a process peculiar to priestly minds, have drawn so largely on them in support of Eucharistic doctrine. Let those who wish to see what the Fathers do teach on the doctrine of the Eucharist buy and read the seven tracts."

The Record.—"Dr Harrison's volumes will prove a great assistance, and be found a repertory of argument and illustration."

Extracts from Reviews of the work entitled, "The Eastward Position, Unscriptural, and not Primitive and Catholic, including a reply to the Rev. M. Shaw's letter on the 'Position of the Celebrant at the Holy Communion.'" Price 6s. *London: Longmans, Green, & Co.*

The Freeman.—"Dr Harrison is unanswerable, and proves his point by most careful and elaborate evidence."

The Rock.—"Dr Harrison is much freer than Dr Howson from what we may call Ecclesiasticism, and attacks the enemy he is confronting with greater boldness. He appeals to Scripture as to an authority not to be shared by any other documents whatever, while, at the same time, he plentifully uses all the resources furnished by the long history of the Church. A glance at his very useful index shows at once the extent and value of the contributions he has levied on all who have alluded to the Eucharistic controversy."

Literary World.—"A volume of nearly 200 pages, in which the author replies to Ritualistic arguments on the position of the Celebrant at the Holy Communion. He shows that the posture claimed by the priestly party in the Church is, as a matter of controversy, quite distinct from the posture in public prayer; that it is of modern origin; was gradually introduced, when about the tenth century the doctrine of the Real Presence of the body and blood of Christ in the consecrated elements began to be recognised, and is contended for as a sign of this doctrine. The plea urged on its behalf is that it is Primitive and Catholic, and this plea is refuted strenuously and in full detail."

The Nonconformist.—"Dr Harrison's book is very thorough and outspoken, decided in its tone, and forcible in its argumentation, showing a very extensive knowledge of authorities, and facts, and skill in the use of them. He meets the Ritualists on their own ground, and with marked ability, contends that their practice is neither Primitive nor Catholic."

Church Quarterly Review.—"It is impossible not to recognise the very considerable powers of this gentleman in the way of argument. He is a great reader, and possesses that knowledge of the work of opponents, without which no man will ever make an effective controversialist. Nevertheless, we do not consider ourselves bound to go into Dr Harrison's arguments."

The Christian Observer and Advocate.—"The various puerilities and absurdities involved in the eastward position viewed *per se*, are trenchantly exposed. As he justly observes, it was a practice which had its origin in ancient heathenism, and when the Fathers inculcated it, they were inculcating 'superstitious regard for a nonentity, and assigning locality to that which

nowhere exists.' . . . As Dr Harrison remarks, the evidence adduced by Bingham, as well as that which he has omitted to adduce, proves that the early churches were not, as a general rule, built with entrances at the west and their chancels placed in the east end, but were placed in an exactly opposite position. . . . The fact is that the modern so-called 'eastward position' is only a cloak for covering and upholding one of the most revolting superstitions of the Church of Rome. When the Church of Rome began to believe the false doctrine, [that of the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements] they shifted their altars about to accommodate their practice to their new doctrine, or rather, as Dr Harrison says, 'without changing at once the posture of the one altar, subsequently called the great altar, behind which the priest stood and performed his acts, facing the people, they constructed smaller altars against the wall, at which the priest stood with his back to the people.' . . . Upon Dr Pusey's behaviour in this matter of the eastward position, in the cathedral of which he is a canon, Dr Harrison makes some stringent and well-merited observations. . . . Dr Harrison's book largely consists of an able and convincing reply to Mr Morton Shaw."

Church Association Monthly Intelligencer.—"Dr Harrison is well known for his volume of searching criticism of the statements and misquotations of Dr Pusey. To his powerful censures, that writer thought best to make no reply. . . . In the present work, Dr Harrison handles a new subject, but one of very immediate interest. The eastward position—a misnomer, as he maintains, for the westward position—is often claimed as Primitive and Catholic. Dr Harrison has gathered a mass of evidence, such as we have never seen collected before, showing that those terms ought to be applied to the precisely contrary position . . . in which the bishop or presiding minister stood on the further side of the holy table, facing both it and the congregation beyond it. . . . Dr Harrison's volume will repay a careful perusal. It is an example of learned and courteous controversy, and a storehouse of facts and arguments, which may be useful to Protestant Churchmen, in answer to the claims so boldly and groundlessly made of 'Primitive and Catholic' authority for doctrines and practices which are un-Catholic and novel."

Standard.—"Among the champions of the Protestant as against the High Church cause, Dr Harrison is one of the stoutest and sturdiest; and adding, as he does, a considerable amount of learning and industry to the fierceness with which he fights against every form of High Church doctrine, he is an opponent not to be ignored. . . . We are bound to admit that the weight of evidence, as here adduced, is positively in his favour."

The English Independent.—"It establishes most triumphantly the fact that the altar in the early churches faced the east, not in the sense of being at the eastern end of the Church, but at the western, and that the priest celebrated looking eastward, standing behind the altar with his face towards the people. His exposure of the errors of Bingham and others on this and other matters is complete; and we can confidently declare that there is no work on the same subject in our language which can be compared with that of Dr Harrison's for its masterly analysis and exposition of all the patristic evidence we possess touching the position of the altar and the ministrant."

The Armoury.—"Dr Harrison shows very clearly that this position is of a heathen and superstitious origin, unknown to the Primitive Church, in connection with the Lord's Supper, but insisted on by Romanists and Ritualists, not because of a peculiar quarter in the heavens, but because they hold that there is a sacrifice on the communion table, and that they are sacrificial priests. Hence the importance of the question. The posture held by them, as Dr Harrison well observes, 'is a most significant symbol, and the most impressive sign, and as such, it is most zealously contended for by the Ritualists.' Dr Harrison, however, shows by abundant evidence that this posture was gradually introduced into the Roman Catholic Church after the doctrine of the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the consecrated elements had become a recognised doctrine."

Weekly Review.—"The learned doctor has certainly established his thesis to our satisfaction, and if the Ritualists will listen to reason, his arguments ought to convince them."

Extracts from Reviews on the Treatise "On the Primitive Mode of Making Bishops, with especial Reference to the Question now before Convocation. Being also an Enquiry as to whether they were created chiefly by those over whom they were to Preside, or by one or more of their own number." Pp. 72. Price 1s. *London: Longmans, Green, and Co.*

The Christian Observer.—"The object of it is to prove that primitive bishops 'received their power of office from the laity by their election of them,' in opposition to the Bishop of Lincoln, who, in his 'Theophilus Anglicanus,' would maintain that 'no earthly power can make a Bishop.' Mr Harrison asserts that in early times they did, and enters into a learned argument, pointing out the fallacy of the Bishop's statement, who would make Bishops the successors of the Apostles, whereas the Fathers held them to be the successors of the seventy disciples. He further argues (p. 43) that 'the evidence adduced by High Anglicans to prove that the apostleship of the twelve has been transferred by ordination to the present canonically ordained Bishops is worthless, if not contemptible;' and asserts that this notion has been believed 'nowhere, never, and by nobody until comparatively modern times."

The Record.—"This vicar is a man of learning and ability, orthodox, and attached to the church of his fathers, but exceedingly dissatisfied with the present mode of making bishops. The point which Mr Harrison brings out most clearly is that the people ought by rights to have a voice in the matter. 'Bishops,' he affirms, 'received their power of office from the laity by their election of them.' 'The apostles,' as Bishop Pearson says, 'are continued to us only in their writings.' Whatever powers are intended by 'the keys,' they lie in the Church at large, and those who exercise them do so in behalf of the Church and not in virtue of any mysterious gift transmitted from the apostles. To use the language of the learned Barrow, whom Mr Harrison quotes, 'the apostolic office was not successive or communicable in perpetual descendance from them, was not designed to continue by derivation, and was an office which no man, without gross imposture and hypocrisy, could challenge to himself.' . . . We have read this paper with much interest."

The Rock.—"This is an historical and learned inquiry how far the Bishops of the Primitive Church of Christ were created by those over whom they were to preside, or by those of their own order. 'The reason why,' says this excellent writer, 'the laity should elect their Bishops rests on the fact that the seat of all power and authority is placed in the Church, as Augustine proves, and Tostatus so elaborately illustrates.' Hooker himself says, 'The whole Church being the true original subject of all power,' and teaches that the authority of Bishops, which they have by the force of custom rather than by any true and heavenly laws is 'a sword which the Church hath power to take from them.'"

The Church Review.—"Mr Harrison himself handles the subject well. . . . They think," says Mr Harrison, "that because they have succession from the Twelve Apostles every one of them has the same extent of jurisdiction which the Twelve had. But this is a claim peculiar to High Anglicans, and unknown to Primitive Christianity. . . . Mr Harrison quotes the Fathers for his views, and justly so. He is also severe on Bishops Wordsworth and Wilberforce for saying, or seeming to say, that the Fathers base all episcopal jurisdiction solely on the apostolical succession. He examines Bishop Wilberforce's quotations from the Fathers by the light of the context to show that the Fathers quoted did not say what the Bishop makes them say. (p. 17.) Time and space would fail to follow this argument: we leave it to the able prelates concerned and to their chaplains. . . . Mr Harrison, being a scholar, as his translations testify, has confidence in his learning, and has returned to it in the present book, and has done us all good service by it. For he not only records what he has found, but he searches deeply into the causes of things which he finds."

N.B.—The Publications noticed in the following pages are all published by The Religious Book Society, 28 Paternoster Row, London, E.C.; and Bazaar, Soho Square.

AN ANSWER, IN SEVEN TRACTS,

TO THE

EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE OF ROMANISTS & RITUALISTS,

IN WHICH IS SHOWN THAT THEIR TEACHING IS CONTRARY TO HOLY SCRIPTURE, AND UNKNOWN TO THE FATHERS.

BY

JOHN HARRISON, D.D., EDIN.,

VICAR OF FENWICK, NEAR DONCASTER.

AUTHOR OF 'WHOSE ARE THE FATHERS?' 'AN ANSWER TO DR PUSEY'S CHALLENGE;' A TREATISE 'ON THE PRIMITIVE MODE OF MAKING BISHOPS;' AND 'THE FATHERS *versus* DR PUSEY.'

TRACT I.

The words 'this is My body,' 'this is My blood of the new covenant,' explained figuratively or elliptically from analogous phrases of the Old Testament, and the private interpretation of such phrases, as given by Dr Wiseman and Dr Pusey, refuted by the universal consent of antiquity, and the testimony of the leading Hebrew scholars.

TRACT II.

A literal interpretation of the words 'this is My body,' 'This is My blood,' proved to be contrary to Holy Scripture, and to the sacramental words and phrases commonly used by the Fathers.

TRACT III.

A literal eating of the flesh of Christ and drinking of His blood as maintained by Dr Wiseman and Dr Pusey, proved to be repugnant to Holy Scripture and the plain teaching of the Fathers.

TRACT IV.

The phraseology commonly quoted from the Fathers to prove the doctrine of the Real Presence in the consecrated elements shown, when interpreted by the Fathers, to be repugnant to that doctrine.

TRACT V.

That which the Fathers teach to be signified or represented in the Lord's Supper, proved to be opposed to the doctrine of the Real Presence as held by Romanists and Ritualists.

TRACT VI.

The words 'Do this in remembrance of Me,' viewed in the light of Holy Scripture and the teaching of the Fathers, proved neither to teach nor to imply either a proper sacrificial act or distinctive priestly functions.

TRACT VII.

An Answer to Dr Jacob's statement that the Fathers of the third and fourth centuries substantially taught the doctrine of the Real Presence as now held by Roman Catholics.

Price 3d. each, postage free, or 2s. per dozen. To be had from the Author
Askern, near Doncaster
1873.